This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

HW 5RU3 S

3754.3.57
C

HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

A HISTORY OF FRENCH LITERATURE

BY

C. H. CONRAD WRIGHT

A.B. (HARV.), M.A. (OXON.)

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF FRENCH IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

AMERICAN BRANCH

NEW YORK: 35 WEST THIRTY-SECOND STREET

LONDON: HENRY FROWDE

1912

All rights reserved

37343.57
C

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
GRATIS
1944

Copyright, 1912
BY OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
AMERICAN BRANCH

TO

MY MOTHER

PREFACE

THE lack of a convenient and yet comprehensive history of French literature, beyond the range of skeleton outlines or compendiums of facts, has long been apparent from experience to the present writer. On the other hand, excellent works in French, such as those of Brunetière or of M. Lanson, are written from a standpoint unfamiliar to the English-speaking reader or

ADDENDA

P. 816: H. Loyson, died 1912.

P. 849: A. Bisson, died 1912.

P. 857: The Italian version of the *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise* has since been condemned for Modernism.

P. 866: H. Langlois, died 1912.

P. 872: M. Montégut, died 1911.

P. 875: P. Quillard, died 1912.

P. 896: To etymological dictionaries add, W. Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, in course of publication.

absolutely independent judgment on every topic. On the contrary, he considers it the duty of the composer of a synthesis to rely, to a reasonable degree, on those who have spent months or years on individual writers whom he must perforce treat summarily. He sets himself down unhesitatingly as a "pickpurse of another's wit": the authorities from whom he has readily drawn will, it is hoped, be found accounted for in the bibliography.

The writer on a foreign literature labors under one great disadvantage: Chauvinism, rather than true patriotism, is apt to

PREFACE

THE lack of a convenient and yet comprehensive history of French literature, beyond the range of skeleton outlines or compendiums of facts, has long been apparent from experience to the present writer. On the other hand, excellent works in French, such as those of Brunetière or of M. Lanson, are written from a standpoint unfamiliar to the English-speaking reader or student, and take too much for granted. M. Lanson's book is, perhaps, the best one-volume history of French literature in existence, but foreigners often find it difficult to handle.

An effort is here made to meet the needs of readers in a work going beyond simple outlines, yet not pretending to specialisation in every period — a thing which is impossible for one man now that we are, of necessity, either mediævalists or moderns. The book might, perhaps, more fittingly be called a "literary history of France," inasmuch as the relations have been emphasised of literature and social environment, and the Latin writings of the Middle Ages have been included. Accuracy has, of course, been sought as far as possible in view of the wide range of the subject. Yet the author does not aspire, as some do, to the merit of an absolutely independent judgment on every topic. On the contrary, he considers it the duty of the composer of a synthesis to rely, to a reasonable degree, on those who have spent months or years on individual writers whom he must perforce treat summarily. He sets himself down unhesitatingly as a "pickpurse of another's wit": the authorities from whom he has readily drawn will, it is hoped, be found accounted for in the bibliography.

The writer on a foreign literature labors under one great disadvantage: Chauvinism, rather than true patriotism, is apt to

take offence at an even occasionally unfavorable verdict and to pronounce the author an "exotic" or untrustworthy judge. Now, indiscriminate praise is not criticism. Moreover, each historian has a right, though a contemporary school denies it, to a definite standpoint. The present writer acknowledges a preference for the Classical and rational in French literature, *as in any literature*, over the Romantic, the sentimental, and emotional. For that reason his sympathies go more to the seventeenth and to the eighteenth centuries than to certain movements and authors of the nineteenth. He cannot escape the conviction that the modern eccentrics, from the *bousingots* of the thirties to the *décadents* of the eighties and nineties, are not characteristic of French common-sense, any more than the false convention of adultery in the novels and plays, or the revelations of certain contemporary "dionysiac" women-writers, are typical of French morals and manners. It should surely be the privilege of one who was largely educated in France, and has chosen as his life-work the study and teaching of French literature, to argue that an occasional apparently harsh judgment is, on the contrary, actuated by a deep sympathy for France and annoyance at seeing it misrepresented in the eyes of other peoples by some of its men of letters. The writer wishes to make it clear, at this prominent place in his work, that, in his opinion, French literature, taken as a whole, overtops in richness, artistic quality, and historical influence, all literatures since those of Greece and of Rome. It has, not merely intellectually but even linguistically, been of vastly greater value to English than the Teutonic sources of that language have been. In the Middle Ages its epic, its romance, its philosophy made France the intellectual centre of Europe; the French lyrics of the sixteenth century permeated, to a much greater degree than was formerly supposed, the poetry of the English Renaissance; the Classicism of the seventeenth century was the model for all European critics; in the eighteenth century the writings of Rousseau (for good or evil) and the theories of the political and social thinkers

created the temper of the nineteenth century; in the nineteenth century itself, French critics and sociologists have led the world — the list might be almost indefinitely extended. This is a constant pre-eminence which no other country can assert, and France can maintain its supremacy without annexing the pseudo-intellect of certain Romantic authors or demanding approval of the "Naturalists." For in the intellectual world the line of Henri de Bornier is true:

Tout homme a deux pays, le sien et puis la France.

The final result of his labors is not what the author could have desired. There come, firstly, to his mind the mediæval Latin verses:

Tot sunt doctores, quot veris tempore flores;
Tot sunt errores, quot habet natura colores.

Secondly, the "concatenati in ergastulo labores" of a teacher's life have often, as Sir Thomas Browne would put it, "contempered celerity with cunctation," without corresponding advantage to composition.

It remains to thank those friends and colleagues whose scholarship has been at the writer's call. Professors E. S. Sheldon, C. H. Grandgent, and Irving Babbitt of Harvard University, have examined and corrected with painstaking care certain important sections; Professor Raymond Weeks of Columbia University has added to criticism practical advice and aid in connection with the actual publication of the work. Not one of these friends would indorse all the views set forth in the following pages, and the author assumes responsibility for the mistakes contained therein. But he desires to express to them his sincere gratitude for their generous aid, and to thank those other friends who have helped him in a minor degree with hints or suggestions.

CONTENTS

PART I

The Middle Ages

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	The Origins of French and of French Literature	3
II	The Epic	14
III	Romance	28
IV	Lyric Poetry	41
V	History, Biography, and Chronicles	51
VI	Fable Literature and Short Stories	62
VII	The Drama	71
VIII	Philosophy	86
IX	Erudition. Didactic and Allegorical Literature	97
X	The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries	111

PART II

The Sixteenth Century

I	The Renaissance	127
II	The Growth of Humanism	135
III	The Transition in Poetry. The Rhétoriqueurs. Lemaire. Marot	144
IV	The Platonists	155
V	Rabelais	164
VI	The Pléiade and its Theories	174
VII	The Pléiade and its Work	188
VIII	The New Philosophy and the New Humanism	199
IX	The Drama	209
X	Reformers and Huguenots	220

CHAPTER PAGE

XI MONTAIGNE 231
XII AUTHORS OF MEMOIRS. HISTORIANS AND POLITICAL WRITERS 242

PART III

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

I TRANSITION WRITERS. THE REIGN OF HENRY IV . . . 251
II THE REFORM IN POETRY. MALHERBE. HIS FRIENDS AND FOES 261
III THE REFORM IN PROSE AND THE GROWTH OF CRITICISM. BALZAC, THE ACADEMY, VAUGELAS, CHAPELAIN . . . 270
IV THE LITERARY IDEALS OF SOCIETY: THEIR EXAGGERATIONS 276
V THE NOVEL. THE EPIC. SATIRE 284
VI THE DRAMA 292
VII CORNEILLE. ROTROU 305
VIII PHILOSOPHY. DESCARTES. CARTESIANISM 321
IX RELIGION. JANSENISM. PORT-ROYAL. PASCAL . . . 332
X RELIGION. MORALS AND EDUCATION 345
XI RACINE 350
XII MOLIÈRE 362
XIII BOILEAU. THE QUARREL OF THE ANCIENTS AND MODERNS. 376
XIV PULPIT ORATORY. BOSSUET. BOURDALOUE 388
XV FÉNELON 400
XVI THE WOMEN OF THE GRAND SIÈCLE 409
XVII MEN OF THE WORLD. SCHOLARS, JOURNALISTS, AND MORALISTS 419
XVIII LA FONTAINE AND THE POETS 434

PART IV

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

I THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY 443
II BAYLE AND FONTENELLE 451
III THE *esprit* OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. THE *salons*. JOURNALISTS 459

CHAPTER		PAGE
IV	TRAGEDY	467
V	MISCELLANEOUS DRAMATIC FORMS: REGULAR COMEDY, THE COMEDY OF THE ITALIANS, THE TEARFUL COMEDY AND *drame bourgeois;* THE *Théâtre de la Foire;* OPERA	476
VI	FICTION	489
VII	MONTESQUIEU. POLITICAL THEORISTS, HISTORIANS, MORALISTS	495
VIII	VOLTAIRE	505
IX	ROUSSEAU	518
X	DIDEROT AND THE ENCYCLOPEDIA	536
XI	THE *philosophes* AND THEIR FOLLOWERS	546
XII	BUFFON AND SAINT-PIERRE	557
XIII	EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY POETRY	564
XIV	EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY POETRY (continued)	570
XV	BEAUMARCHAIS. THE COMING OF THE REVOLUTION	581
XVI	THE REVOLUTION	587

PART V

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

I	THE EMPIRE	601
II	MADAME DE STAËL	609
III	CHATEAUBRIAND	616
IV	THE TREND OF THOUGHT (1815–1850). POLITICS AND RELIGION. ROMANTIC MANIFESTATIONS	627
V	THE TREND OF THOUGHT (1815–1850). PHILOSOPHERS AND SOCIOLOGISTS	639
VI	ROMANTICISM	650
VII	THE POETS	666
VIII	VICTOR HUGO	682
IX	THE DRAMA	691
X	FICTION	708
XI	HISTORIANS, CRITICS, AND PUBLICISTS	725
XII	THE SECOND HALF OF THE CENTURY. SAINTE-BEUVE, TAINE, AND RENAN	738

CHAPTER PAGE

XIII FICTION 757
XIV THE DRAMA 779
XV POETRY 790
XVI PHILOSOPHERS, HISTORIANS, ORATORS, CRITICS, AND JOURNALISTS 810

PART VI

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

I THE TENDENCIES 827
II THE WRITERS 845

BIBLIOGRAPHY 881
INDEX 939

PART I

THE MIDDLE AGES

A HISTORY OF FRENCH LITERATURE

CHAPTER I

THE ORIGINS OF FRENCH AND OF FRENCH LITERATURE

AMONG those languages which have shared the intellectual and literary hegemony of Europe the most important belong to the Greek, to the Latin, or to the Germanic group. French is of Latin origin, and is historically derived with no solution of continuity, so that without undue paradox it might almost be said that the language of the French today is a form of late Latin. It is true that Virgil and Cicero would find it as difficult to make themselves understood on the boulevards as it would have been for an African or a Scythian in the Forum; but nevertheless there is an unbroken thread in the historical series of past ages, so that it is impossible to say precisely at what moment Latin ceased to exist in France and French took its place. We are restricted to general conclusions based on the changes in the sounds (Phonology) or in the form of words (Morphology), and we say that it was about this time or near that date, within half a century or so, that certain changes or developments occurred.

French is, then, a Latin idiom. And what differentiates it from English, in which the majority of words is also of Latin derivation? The answer must be that in French it is not a question of vocabulary alone, but also of grammatical construction, whereas the framework of English is Teutonic.

But neither French nor Latin has always existed in the land. There was once a Gaul, and we still speak of the *esprit gaulois*

to designate the popular mocking humor of the French. The inhabitants of Gaul spoke languages of their own having only the remotest connection with Greek or with Latin, and the opening lines of Caesar's *Commentaries* are the *locus classicus* on this point and on the division of the soil between the Belgians, the Aquitanians, and the Celts or Gauls.

These last occupied most of the territory, but their language has almost entirely disappeared, except in so far as modern Breton is indirectly connected with it through the British Isles. It is, however, in Brittany rather than elsewhere that we must seek traces of these old Gauls or Celts and of the languages spoken before the Roman conquest. The Bretons of Brittany came over at the time of the Anglo-Saxon invasions. The inhabitants of the province form a race apart and have not experienced the successive infiltrations of races and of languages which poured into the rest of the mainland. It is only of late years that the French government is succeeding by compulsory education, military service, and by anti-clerical legislation in breaking down the barriers of language.

The character of the Celts thus studied is very different from what the French now call the *esprit gaulois*. This is a compound result, coming from the agglomeration of different elements, instead of the *esprit celtique* described by Renan as mystical, melancholy, and dreamy:

> Cette race a soif de l'infini; elle le poursuit à tout prix, au-delà de la tombe, au-delà de l'enfer.

When the Romans invaded Gaul they brought with them an infinitely superior civilisation. They established educational centres, taught law and new ways of commerce and government which replaced the primitive methods of the natives. The use of Latin was encouraged, and those among the Gauls who knew the conquerors' speech could aspire to the highest dignities in literature, war, and statecraft. Moreover, the Gauls, not so very remote from early rovers, had no written literature. Their

chronicles and bodies of doctrine existed in the form of songs passed on from generation to generation. The national priests, the Druids, were doubtlessly the only depositaries of learning and science, which they transmitted orally to their initiates and novices, whose probation must have extended through years. Other popular war-songs may have been known to the people under the mnemonic form which rude poetry gives.

All traces of this literature have disappeared. The Romans, first by commerce and then by conquest, swept it away, as they very slowly but surely also did the language. The vocabulary of the modern successors of the Gauls contains only a handful of words of Celtic origin, many of them being geographical names.

It is not to be supposed, however, that the Latin which took the place of Celtic speech was only the literary language of Rome in its purest form. The language chiefly used by the newcomers was popular Latin, *sermo plebeius* or *rusticitas*, the language of farmers, peasants, and soldiers, itself fairly at variance with the Latin of literature, *sermo urbanus* or *latinitas*, though separated from it not absolutely, but by small differentiations, as the speech of a Yorkshire or a New England farmer varies from the language of Matthew Arnold or Emerson. The literary language was, to a marked degree, an artificial one, much influenced by Greek, for the Roman writers in drama and in philosophy had imitated the more intellectual Hellenes. Popular Latin was, on the contrary, more simple in construction and possessed a simple vocabulary. It was, above all, a more fickle and changeable speech.

Thus, during the first four centuries of the Christian era we find in Gaul two Latins, one used by scholars as a written language, though already somewhat corrupted, the other the speech of the people. Both in time underwent modifications, but it was the popular Latin which changed the more. Written Latin remained, with some changes, through all the Middle Ages as a means of communication for the scholars. It is often

called learned Low Latin. Popular Latin changed so quickly that by the fifth century it deserves a new name: it is known as popular Low Latin or *gallo-roman*, from the fifth to the ninth century, under the dynasties of the Merovingians and early Carolingians. And the most important stage of the transition from Latin to *gallo-roman* was that beginning with the invasion of the Germanic tribes, particularly the Franks, in the fifth century.

This Germanic invasion is very important, because it completely changed the history of the land. From now on we must cease speaking of Gaul and call it the land of the Franks, what will later be France. The newcomers were not absolute barbarians, but their civilisation was inferior to that of the people whose domain they occupied. Therefore, just as the Romans had conquered Greece without imposing on it their language, so the Germanic invaders brought some of their manners and customs, but did not do away with the speech or civilisation of the vanquished people. They occasioned changes and additions, especially in the form of terms of war and of feudalism, but not to any extraordinary degree.

Nevertheless, the period from the fifth century onward presents a different aspect. The social organism is partly Latin, partly Germanic. The language is Low Latin instead of Latin. Certain tribes, especially at the north and east, try to keep their own speech and do so for a time, but are gradually obliged to choose between one or the other civilisation. It is the period of the Merovingian dynasty, when the various languages of which we have spoken are designated by such names as the following: *Lingua teutonica*, *theotisca*, *francisca* or Teutonic; *Lingua romana*, *gallo-roman* or popular Low Latin; *Lingua latina*, learned Low Latin.

It is difficult to trace the historical changes which took place during this remote and little known period, because of the lack of documentary evidence in the form of manuscripts, and we are often obliged to reason very hypothetically. The general

conclusion, however, is that the popular Low Latin, on the whole, continues the tendencies of popular Latin, though with slow and successive changes. Many words disappear as unnecessary, others come in to fill a want. The forms of grammar are simplified: the declensions and conjugations lose many of their classic distinctions. The verbs, in particular, are differently organised, and by means of auxiliaries some Latin tenses are replaced by new constructions, as *amabo* by forms based on *amare habeo*. Finally, syntax also continues the tendencies of popular Latin and substitutes simple and analytic constructions for the synthesis of classical Latin. Of these tendencies we have some proofs, particularly in documents like the *Glossaries* of Reichenau and Cassel of the eighth or early ninth centuries. The *Glossary* of Reichenau is a partial vocabulary containing words of learned Latin translated into somewhat more popular speech. The *Glossary* of Cassel translates *gallo-roman* words and sentences into Teutonic.

We now reach another line of demarcation. The Merovingian dynasty has disappeared and has been replaced by the Carolingians or Carlovingians. Charlemagne, who, in spite of his admiration for Latin culture, was himself more Germanic than Latin, and whose own native language was the *lingua theotisca*, is dead, and the divisions have begun in the empire which resulted in the modern French and Germanic nations. Finally, in February, 842, we come into possession of a written document which accentuates many differences hitherto only suspected and which seems almost to belong to a new language. That is why people agree, though somewhat arbitrarily, in placing here the beginning of a new historical division of the language, which they call French, just as the kingdom of France begins with the treaty of Verdun in 843. This document contains the *Serments de Strasbourg* or so-called "bilingual oaths" of the grandsons of Charlemagne. Charles le Chauve and Louis le Germanique were allied against their brother, the emperor Lothaire. In support of this alliance they swore

fidelity in presence of their soldiers. But as these spoke two different languages, the army of Charles le Chauve, coming from Neustria in the west, could not be understood by the soldiers of Louis le Germanique, who used the *lingua theotisca*. It was therefore necessary to take the oath in the two languages, and it is one of these forms which is looked upon as one of the earliest examples of French, of which we are to survey the literature. The next early documents of importance were the sequence or *cantilène* of *Sainte Eulalie* (end of the ninth century) and the tenth-century poems of the *Passion* and the *Vie de saint Léger*.

In the course of the vulgar Latin period there occurred a gradual division of the language, producing the later languages or dialect groups known as *langue d'oïl* in the north and *langue d'oc* in the south, so-called because of the different ways of expressing "yes." The *langue d'oïl*[1] is French in its various parallel dialectical forms, of which all but one gradually decline as literary media and become patois; the *langue d'oc* (*hoc*) consists of the various forms of Provençal speech used in the south and finding expression in the rich literature of the troubadours, but before long ceasing in all its branches to be a literary medium until the artificial recrudescence of the present day.

Of all the divisions of either language the most important for our purposes is the language of the Ile-de-France, of Paris and the surrounding country. But such was not always the case, and in the Middle Ages, Champagne, Picardy, Normandy,

[1] *Langue d'oïl*, in which phrase *oïl* was at first two words meaning "yes, he" or "yes, they," gradually coming to stand for "yes," simply; it is the modern *oui*. The French originally said "yes, I," "yes, you," "yes, we," etc., where the pronoun was the subject of an unexpressed verb easily supplied from the question. *Oïl* is thus an agglutination of two words accidentally standing close together, but not forming a compound and *not syntactically connected*. Old French also had *o* alone = "yes." The derivation may be briefly put as being from two Old French words, coming from Latin *hoc*, in vulgar Latin taking the sense "yes," + *ille*, vulgar *illī*, meaning "he" or "they"; or *hoc . Illi* (with a period between the two words).

all had abundant literatures, the study of which is part of our task. The growing preponderance of French is to be explained partly by the position of the kings. The Ile-de-France was their original domain, which they gradually increased, after the coming of the Capetian house at the very end of the tenth century, by attacking the feudal lords and taking possession of their territory. The struggle was a long and stubborn one, but by the end of the thirteenth century royalty was victorious.

The period from the ninth to the fourteenth century is that of Old French, a language of vast wealth of expression, with a syntax differing in several respects from the modern usage and a vigorous and resonant enunciation. It became pre-eminent among the languages of Europe and spread its influence far and wide: numberless traces still remain in English. In the fourteenth century a new period begins: the distinction of two cases in nouns and adjectives hitherto preserved to a considerable extent, though it had already suffered severely, is now almost entirely lost. This has very far-reaching consequences on the order of words, which is obliged to conform more to a logical than to an artistic sequence. Indeed, all syntax is affected. This second period, which lasts until the sixteenth century, is sometimes called that of Middle French, and is succeeded in turn by Modern French, from the seventeenth century on.

The language during the second stage is far less picturesque and varied until towards its close, though it receives in turn successive infiltrations of learned words introduced by scholars and translators, particularly in the fourteenth century, and of classical and Italian words brought in during the Renaissance.

The learned writings of the Middle Ages were preserved by the monks and clerks, but the medium of composition and transmission of popular literature during that period was the minstrel, who stood for all that books and libraries now give in the way of entertainment. The mediæval minstrel is also undoubtedly the meeting-point of Latin and of Germanic tendencies. On the one hand, the Latin *mimi* had fallen in

repute and had degenerated into wandering mountebanks and buffoons, singing and playing tricks. On the other hand, the German invaders brought with them traditions of poetry as well as manners. Their minstrels or bards, if we may be allowed a word now somewhat in disfavor, led the songs of war and daring, perhaps destined to grow into the formal epic. The travelling minstrels of the Middle Ages between the eleventh and the fourteenth centuries partly represent both traditions. Their standing is, however, a new one, and they are not all of a kind. They often went through the land wearing multicolored garb and entertaining nobility and populace in hall or in market-place with narrative and romance sung to a plain and monotonous rhythm on *vielle* or *rote*. These were the *ioculatores*, *jougleurs*, or *jongleurs*. Some composed their own poems which in transmission became modified by the linguistic tendencies of those who received them in different dialects or, on the other hand, by literary *procédés* or altered treatment, reshaping of plot, of metre, invention of new episodes or characters.

Consequently, we find, as we survey the field of mediæval minstrelsy, the *trouveurs* or *trouvères* who composed and sang songs, epic and sometimes lyrical, or even recited for the benefit of the common populace the too-frequently obscene *fabliaux;* then the common buffoons of a lower type who, as our modern jugglers or clowns, have inherited the name of the *jongleurs*. In the Provençal literature of southern France there was sometimes a further differentiation, and the *trobaire* or troubadour, often of noble or even royal rank, composed his lyric songs which he left to *joglars* to spread abroad. But, on the whole, the great distinction in France is a twofold one: in the north the *trouvères*, who composed or sang the abundant epic, lyric, and satiric verse; in the south the more gallant and often aristocratic troubadours, who composed the complicated lyric melodies connected with their names. To these two classes must be added a third, consisting of wandering students or scholars, men of intellect but of dissolute life, idle hangers-on of

universities, and more versed in "wine, women, and song" than in austere philosophy. These so-called *Goliardi* — because of their mock bishop, the imaginary Goliardus — wandered through the land singing erotic or Bacchic verse in the rich neo-Latin rhymed metre, and adding to lyric poetry a wealth of song which, because of its unfamiliar language, has not been appreciated at its full worth, but which for melody, vigor, and dash deserves to rank with the best lyric light verse which the world has produced.

There have been three revivals in French literature. The first is connected with the name of Charlemagne, the second is that of the twelfth century, the third is the definite Renaissance of the spirit of antiquity which has made its influence felt down to the present time.

Much is owed to Charlemagne. After the fall of Roman authority, intellectual training and learning were during the Merovingian dynasty at their lowest ebb. Charlemagne, in whom culminated the growing power of Pepin's house, saw all the strength that could accrue to his government by encouraging learning. To his reign are due, therefore, not only a thorough political and religious reorganisation of the mighty empire, but a noteworthy scholarly activity. Charlemagne tried to disseminate knowledge and give greater fixity to the popular language as well as to Latin, the learned tongue which had become more and more debased. So he grouped about him men of rare attainments: Peter of Pisa, Paulus Diaconus from Italy, Theodulfus the Goth from Spain, but, above all, Alcuin from York, where learning flourished. Alcuin came to the continent about 781 and taught for fifteen years, with certain intervals during which he returned to England. About 800 he became abbot of Saint-Martin of Tours, where he died in 804. He wrote on grammar, rhetoric, morals, mathematics, music, and theology. In 787 Charlemagne issued an important proclamation or capitulary to the clergy on education, and with the help or at the instigation of Alcuin organised great schools throughout the empire. He favored primary schools, so far as

teachers could be provided for them, in the villages, higher ones in the monasteries and cathedrals; and in his own palace, and perhaps always travelling in his train, he kept a band of picked scholars, and students who were trained in the higher sciences so far as these went: the Palatine School. Admission to this was due not to rank but to merit. In his own immediate circle he had organised an informal Palatine Academy of his friends, *academici* Alcuin calls them. Here there was comparatively little formality or etiquette. The members were the princes, scholars, and dignitaries of the court, and even women belonged to the circle, which may have had its social side of love and intrigue as well as that of deep learning. Each member bore a pseudonym from classic or sacred antiquity: Charlemagne was David, who smote the Philistines and sang the psalms; Alcuin was Flaccus; and Theodulfus, Pindar.

To Charlemagne and Alcuin are due not only the encouragement of lay literature, which flourishes with such names as that of Einhard, but more particularly the establishment of the tradition of learning in the Church, so that the schools of the monasteries and of the cathedral cities are the depositories of knowledge until the rise of the universities in the twelfth century. The old manuscripts were carefully recopied and disseminated, especially at Alcuin's own monastery at Tours, and the world probably owes an incalculable debt of gratitude to him for saving the great Latin authors. There were studied and copied not only the Fathers of the Church and the late Latin authorities who were to influence all mediæval thought, like Boethius, Cassiodorus, Isidore of Seville, and Martianus Capella, but the greater writers, Virgil, Cicero, Statius, and Lucan.

After the reign of Charlemagne, under Louis le Débonnaire, there is perhaps less original inspiration, but scholarship is not dead, and even during the new trials and tribulations of internal dissension and Norman invasion the torch of learning is handed on to men like Alcuin's pupil Rabanus Maurus, the German, and then to Walafridus Strabo, Servatus Lupus of Ferrières,

and Radbertus Paschasius. All through the often scoffed-at period from the ninth to the twelfth century there were hives of intellectual activity in monasteries and abbeys like Saint-Martin at Tours, Ferrières in Gâtinais, Saint-Germain-des-Prés, Saint-Denis, Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire, Saint-Bertin, Fleury-sur-Loire, Saint-Ouen at Rouen, Jumièges, and Le Bec, the home of Lanfranc and of Anselm. Famous among the cathedral or chapter schools were those of Auxerre, Orléans (Theodulfus), Reims (Gerbert, afterwards Pope Sylvester II), Chartres (Fulbert), and Paris. Indeed, it is at Paris in the twelfth century that the university grows up from schools like those of Saint-Victor, Notre-Dame, as well as the peripatetic school of Abélard. New monastic orders or congregations spring also into existence, like Cluny (Odon de Cluny), followers of Saint Benedict, and later Cîteaux with its offshoot Clairvaux, the home of Saint Bernard in the twelfth century. At the time of the second revival the new order of Dominicans in the thirteenth century tried by their teaching and preaching to spread education through all classes and to counteract the mystical extravagances of their rivals the Franciscans.

CHAPTER II

THE EPIC

THE early popular literature in France centres about the epic, that being its most influential and far-spreading, and at the same time its most original, production. As expressed in the *chansons de geste* it went deepest into the hearts of the people, and perhaps did more for the glory of mediæval France than any other form of literary composition. The epic material divides, according to the usual classification repeated from Bodel's *Chanson des Saisnes*, into three branches:

> Ne sont que trois matieres à nul homme antandant:
> De France, de Bretaigne et de Rome la grant.

We have here to deal only with the *chansons de geste*, songs of deeds (*gesta*), the manifestation of the warlike and feudal element of the race, as the stories of the Round Table and of antiquity are those of romance and of learning.

The early history of the French national epic takes us back to the realm of hypothesis and of theory, into which it can scarcely be our province to go.[1] According to the hitherto current view the French heroic poems are the result of Germanic influences, or of the Germanic spirit in a Romanic mould and form, giving a result which is neither Celtic, Germanic, nor Roman, but a new compound. Tacitus tells us that among the Germanic peoples popular songs were much in vogue. With

[1] For a brief survey of the many theories concerning the origin of the heroic epic, cf. Voretzsch, *Einführung in das Studium der altfranzösischen Literatur*, conclusion of Chap. III, and Becker, *Grundriss der altfranzösischen Literatur*, beginning of Chap. II. The "pilgrimage" theory is still more recent.

regard to the territory now called France, it is to be remembered that, though the population of this land was fairly homogeneous, except where lived the Basques and the Bretons, and though this homogeneity was in the first place one of a Latin civilisation, yet it was in time considerably modified by the Germanic invasions of the Franks, particularly in the borderlands of what was then France and of Burgundy, where the early epic was especially successful.

The newcomers, belonging to a warlike and predatory race, fond of battle songs and of incitements to glorious deeds by the narrative of heroic achievements, brought with them this tendency to celebrate in song their mighty men. As they gradually took up the language of the country in which they settled, these songs, or new ones like them, were modified by the influence of popular Romanic or non-Teutonic versification: the travelling Teutonic bard, descendant of the *scopas*, and the cultured Gallo-Roman singer vied with each other in the early feasts and banquets when the two civilisations were blending. The more impressive songs of national tradition won the day, but they were influenced by the scholarly language and expression of the Gallo-Romans. Later, Neustria, the least Teutonic of the districts, becomes the home of the epic: the Gallo-Romans have accepted the Germanic offering and have made it their own.

Just what form these early songs took, or at what period we need begin our hypotheses, is less significant. They may have been lyric or lyrico-epic poems in which the narrative element developed more and more as curiosity grew about the facts which everybody knew at first; or they may have started in the epic or narrative form contemporaneously with the event, or from oral tradition. Under the Merovingian dynasty there undoubtedly existed collections of rude and uncouth narrative melodies of which we have faint traces perhaps in historical allusions, or in the later *Floovant* of the twelfth century, or in the Latin rendering of a few lines of a song or round concerning Clotaire's victory over the Saxons. This, a Latin life of Saint

Faro by Hildegarius of Meaux in the ninth century tells us, was popularly sung (*juxta rusticitatem*) at the period in the seventh century contemporaneous with the events:

> De Chlotario est canere rege Francorum,
> Qui ivit pugnare in gentem Saxonum.

It is quite likely that from such short rounds, if the theory be accepted, were gradually developed, without even the necessary disappearance of the original type, the longer *chansons de geste*. The starting-point of the French epic is, then, Teutonic in that it is historical rather than mythical, like so many legends of other antiquities.[1] Its spirit, too, is the expression of a civilisation based on the Teutonic ideal of war and feudalism, modified by Christianity. It is the living, but generally anonymous, expression of a people's spirit and deserves, therefore, the name of national, particularly when the conversion of the barbarian Clovis fills the people with the sentiment of a new unity and of a nation grouped about its ruler.

The theory of the lyrico-epic poems just set forth, which is connected chiefly with the name of Gaston Paris, is now opposed by the absolutely different view of M. Joseph Bédier. Even if not as yet accepted by the majority of scholars, it is evidence of an interesting and significant reaction against the old romantic views of folk poesy and popular epic which have held sway since the invention of the Wolffian theory concerning Homer, itself now the object of so many attacks.

M. Bédier's theory, briefly stated, is that the epic legends were formed by the combined efforts of monks and *jongleurs* to edify and entertain pilgrims and merchants at the exhibitions of relics and fairs in the vicinity of abbeys or places of pilgrimage. He argues that no real proof or specimen remains of the so-called primitive epic. On the contrary, the *chansons de geste* really belong to the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and are largely

[1] It is not to be inferred, of course, that there were no mythical epics in the Teutonic languages; quite the contrary.

related to sanctuaries on the pilgrimage roads of Europe. He applies his theory to various groups of poems, such as the cycle of Guillaume d'Orange which he connects with the abbey of Saint-Guilhem-du-Désert, not far from Montpellier on the way to Santiago; the poems on Girard de Roussillon belonging to the abbeys of Vézelay and Pothières in Burgundy. Similarly, other poems are linked with the pilgrimage to Rome and the Italian highway, or with abbeys in northern France. Thus the *chansons de geste* are the result of conscious composition, even when built up from fragments, rather than of mere lisping in numbers.

The French epic lasts for several centuries, and its influence spreads all over Europe. It is found in the form of long narrative poems divided into stanzas or *laisses* of varying length, and consisting usually, but not always, of decasyllabic verses. There may be a trace of lyric poetry in the refrain AOI of the *Chanson de Roland*. When the minstrels were in their glory and sang the *laisses*, these were constructed with assonance, an imperfect rhyme in which the vowels only need be alike. Later, assonance gave way to rhyme. Indeed, rhyme had much to do with the decadence of the French epic; for, the fountain of inspiration not having been renewed, the later poems were often merely reconstructions of the earlier ones, in which lines were padded out for the sake of rhyme, otiose epithets were inserted, and redundant phrases recurred with exasperating frequency. At last, when in the fifteenth century the prose renderings became fashionable, it may be said that the epic no longer has any great value, though descendants of the old stories are still told to children today. The French epic spread all over Europe from cold north to sunny south, and, in the Renaissance, Boiardo and Ariosto played with the venerable legends.

Of the primitive epic, if the traditional view is accepted, we have, as has been stated, no example. The early poems may have furnished much to the chroniclers and historians, such as Fredegarius and others. To some students of literature it may

perhaps seem fortunate that the rougher and uncouth versions have disappeared. This enables us to begin our study at the period of greatest excellence and with some of the better epics of popular literature, foremost of which is the famous *Chanson de Roland.* Others of the earliest poems known are the *Roi Louis,* which is of feudal inspiration, the first 1979 lines of the *Chanson de Guillaume,* and the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne,* a short mock-heroic poem relating a trip of Charlemagne and his peers to Jerusalem and Constantinople, where their wild bragging and boasting are humorously described. These poems all belong to about the end of the eleventh century.

The French epic is a composite formation consisting of a large number of poems, many yet remaining unpublished. Dealing, as they did, with national though often legendary heroes, and repeated as they were by countless poets, they gradually formed a vast *corpus* of tradition. Unconscious classification was introduced, and the material is presented to us in the shape of both families and cycles. Not only were the deeds of heroes told, but also those of other members of their families, so that we have epic genealogies and tales of fathers as well as of sons, *enfances* as well as *chevaleries.* Warriors belonging to different periods were linked together, and the most noteworthy form which the composite method takes is when the historic deeds of different members of a family are combined and attributed to the most important member of that race. Thus most of the ancestors and successors of Charlemagne are united in one dominant character of epic literature who stands as the type of the imperial ruler. It is true that Charlemagne varies greatly according to the period at which the author is composing and according to the feeling which he represents — national or feudal; at times he is dignified and majestic, awing his opponents by his noble presence and even accomplishing miracles, at times he is cowardly and almost dishonorable. Still Charlemagne remains the hero of French epic. And we need no nobler portrait of him than exists in the *Chanson de Roland.* Indeed, the

historical Charlemagne was canonised, though by an anti-pope, Pascal III. Those poems which make him ridiculous are feudal.

The cyclic tendency may be superimposed upon the grouping by genealogies and is a convenient though not chronological method of rough classification of these poems. The old writers themselves set up three branches or *gestes:* of the King, of Garin de Monglane or of Guillaume, of Doon de Mayence. This classification is sometimes convenient, but it must not be considered exhaustive in any way, and modern scholars often group the works quite differently. Thus M. Gautier adds to these three cycles four other numbers, including the *gestes provinciales*, particularly of Lorraine and of Burgundy, the cycle of the Crusades, and two groups of miscellaneous poems belonging to the latest dates and quite unconnected with the previous groups.

The spirit of the mediæval epic finds its noblest embodiment in the majestic figure of Charlemagne. There is no need to ask his name:

S'est ki l'demandet, ne l'estoet enseignier.

His father Pepin alone remains by his side, and Charles Martel even is swallowed into the personality of Charlemagne. Thus *Mainet* gives the story of Charles Martel attributed to Charlemagne. The emperor's life is beyond that of other mortals, his gigantic stature terrifies his foes who, Christians and infidels alike, tremble at his passage, as he goes by with flowing white beard ("l'emperere à la barbe florie") and followed by his twelve noble peers like the twelve apostles, among them the Nestor-like figure of duke Naimes and the inseparable companions Roland and Oliver. Charlemagne with his sword Joyeuse is the protector of honor and justice and the embodiment of that love of country which did exist in the Middle Ages, though its birth is often placed at a much later date. At the same time there is an element of sadness about his character which adds to it a greater dignity still:

Deus! dist li reis, si penuse est ma viel

The epic material and the idea of Charlemagne were probably first drawn from writings almost contemporary with him, such as the works of the German monk of Saint-Gall and other biographies. Some of the poems we possess deal with fantastical and apocryphal stories concerning the emperor's origin and childhood: *Berte au grand pied*, *Mainet*, his expeditions against the Saracens of Italy (*Aspremont*) or of Spain (*Roland*) or against the Saxons. This last group is best exemplified by the *Chanson des Saisnes*, of the end of the twelfth century, by Bodel, which is influenced by the period and environment of the Romances of the Round Table. Charlemagne fought also his disobedient vassals, and in the feudal epic the anti-royal mood finds expression after the end of the ninth century. Of such a spirit examples are *Raoul de Cambrai*, the cycle of the Loherains (*Hervis de Metz*, *Garin le Loherain*, *Girbert de Metz*, *Anséis*), and the famous stories of the *Quatre fils Aimon*, or Renaud de Montauban, one of these sons, and the magician cousin Maugis. Renaud de Montauban was playing chess with the nephew of Charlemagne. The nephew struck him, and Charlemagne would not give him satisfaction. Renaud killed the nephew, and rebellion followed, in which the sons of the powerful vassal were driven to seek refuge in the Ardennes and to rely for their safety on their good horse Bayard or on the wondrous deeds of their cousin Maugis of Aigremont.

As the years went by through the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, there were remodellings of old legends and new accretions, until finally the epic cycles were constituted. In these cycles complete genealogies of families were evolved, with extensive ramifications in the different poems. The important ones were three in number: of the King, of Garin de Monglane or of the south, of Doon de Mayence or of feudalism. So the author of *Doon de Mayence* says:

> Bien sceivent li plusor, n'en sui pas en doutanche,
> Qu'il n'eut que trois gestes u reaume de Franche:
> Si fu la premeraine de Pepin et de l'ange,

L'autre apres, de Garin de Monglane la franche,
Et la tierche si fu de Doon de Maience,
Un chevalier vaillant et de grant sapience.

The third cycle was little more than an omnium-gatherum and included much that would not go into the other ones. It contained the traitors, a branch much developed in Italy. The second cycle was largely a southern one, its heroes were southerners, and it told of fights with the Saracens. It is an important group and is known also by the names of Girart de Viane, Aimeri de Narbonne, and Guillaume au court nez. It is a vast genealogical collection of over one hundred and twenty thousand verses, telling in many poems of Garin de Monglane and his descendants, the forefather being tacked on later. Of all these heroes the most striking is Guillaume d'Orange, *au court nez* or *au courb nez* ("with the hook-nose"). The poem of *Girart de Viane* is also a good one and contains the famous fight of Roland and Oliver.

In addition to these cycles may be mentioned a minor one, more distinctly historical in that it is based on recent events, the group of the Crusades. The source, instead of going back to remote ages, is often a modern one, though it is sometimes treated in the usual fantastic manner. This cycle is not so much one of national patriotism as of foreign warfare and of romantic adventure, at times vieing in fancy with the stories of the Round Table. The oldest poem is the *Chanson d'Antioche*, written not later than the middle of the twelfth century; it is knightly and historical in spirit. The *Chanson de Jérusalem*, written soon after, is more popular and legendary. A little later the romantic spirit is developed in the stories of the *Chevalier au Cygne* and of *Godefroi de Bouillon*. The story of the swan-knight, indeed, became one of the greatest poetical *motifs* of modern times and is found in the folk-lore of Grimm's fairy tales as well as in the German versions of the Grail legend and the story of Lohengrin. Its accompanying *motif* of the innocent bride and mother persecuted and by a cruel mother-in-law

accused of giving birth to a monster became also famous. Later, in the fourteenth century, this cycle of the Crusades fell into burlesque and parody, as in *Baudoin de Sebourg*. Such, after all, was the general fate of all the epic material. The stock topics of these poems, tournament, quarrel, challenge, fight, banquet, became more and more hackneyed, and are treated in a burlesque or flippant way, or else the stories are transformed into dull prose renderings. The old dignity of the primitive *chanson de geste*, which had something Hellenic about it, disappears: Charlemagne is no longer Agamemnon ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν, or Naimes a Nestor, or Roland a brave Achilles. The long war with England scarcely brings out one or two flashes of poetry, such as the noble *Combat des Trente*, the contest of thirty Bretons and of thirty Englishmen. The well-meaning but prosaic *Bertrand du Guesclin* shows that the days of the epic are over.

The French epic may perhaps best be understood by a more detailed study of three of its finest examples, the *Chanson de Roland*, *Aliscans*, and *Huon de Bordeaux*.[1]

The song of Roland, the oldest and noblest of the existing poems, belongs in the form known to us to the last third of the eleventh century, or perhaps to the earliest years of the twelfth, though probably there were earlier versions. The minstrel Taillefer sang a song of Roland at the battle of Hastings. The present poem was perhaps written by a Norman, who may have come from Avranches or the Mont Saint-Michel, but whose name is unknown, that of Turoldus at the conclusion being perhaps only the copyist's signature. It contains four thousand

[1] It would be beyond the scope of the present work to enter into details concerning the very numerous *chansons de geste*. For further information about the poems, their contents, and bibliographical material, the inquirer may be referred to such introductory works as Gaston Paris's *La littérature française au moyen-âge*, or the chapter on the epic by L. Gautier in the history of French literature edited by Petit de Julleville (Vol. I). In German very useful are Gröber's *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, II, i; Voretzsch's *Einführung;* and Ph. Aug. Becker's *Grundriss der altfranzösischen Literatur*.

and two decasyllabic verses, assonanced and divided into *laisses*. Its historical basis is slight: brief allusion is made in the chronicles of Einhard to the fact that in 778, when Charlemagne was returning from an expedition into Spain, his rear-guard was attacked, and among those killed was Hruodlandus, prefect of the borderland of Brittany. On this slight foundation is built a mighty tale of patriotism, treachery, and revenge.

For seven years Charlemagne has fought in Spain, reducing the whole country except the city of Saragossa, whose king Marsile sends an embassy to treat of peace. Among the advisers of Charlemagne two parties are at variance, one led by Charlemagne's noble nephew Roland who wishes to fight, the other by Roland's stepfather, the traitor Ganelon, who hates him. When the French army starts for home, Roland is placed in command of the rear-guard, and about him gather all the noblest leaders of the army. But, as they are going through the defiles of the Pyrenees, they are attacked by a numberless host of Saracens. The army is massacred: four of the French are left, then Roland and Turpin alone; and finally Roland, after valiant efforts to summon help with his horn and to break his noble sword Durandal to prevent it from falling into the hands of the enemy, dies on the battlefield strewn with the bodies of the twenty thousand dead. Charlemagne hears the call for help, but arrives too late to save his nephew. On the return home Ganelon is tried by feudal rites, champion against champion. He is torn asunder by horses, and Charlemagne, melancholy and careworn, bears the burden of his weary life.

The poem of *Aliscans*,[1] in the form which we possess, is a

[1] It might perhaps be more logical to analyse the newly discovered and recently published *Chanson de Guillaume*, which probably represents an older version of the story. But the *Aliscans* still has the advantage of longer publicity. On the *Chanson de Guillaume*, see P. Meyer in *Romania* (1903), and R. Weeks in *Modern Philology* (1904 and 1905) and in *The Library*, London (1965).

rhymed version of about seven thousand lines by an unknown poet at least a century more modern than the *Chanson de Roland*, although again there must have been earlier texts. The style is much inferior to the poem of Roland, but it contains many fine passages. Its only historical basis is the struggle against the Saracens, in which memories of Charles Martel's victory at Poitiers in 732 are perhaps confused with the defeat of Guillaume de Provence in 793 by the Saracens. The poem belongs to the cycle of Garin de Monglane, and the hero is the epic Guillaume d'Orange or Guillaume au court nez, more probably the historical Guillaume, comte de Toulouse, who became Saint Guillaume de Gellone.

The poem plunges at once into the action:

> A icel jor ke la dolor fu grans
> Et la bataille orible en Aliscans,
> Li quens Guillaumes i soufri grans ahans.

It is the day of a great defeat in the plain of Aliscans, where Count Guillaume, in spite of heroic deeds of valor, is vanquished, and his noble nephew, the enfant Vivien, is killed. The count fights his way back to Orange, where his wife, Countess Guiborc, at first fails to recognise him, disguised as he is in pagan garb, until his heroism proves that he is her husband. On hearing of the death of all his comrades, including Vivien, she bids him seek help from the emperor at Saint-Denis. Thither he hastens, is at first ill received, but by his anger cows the emperor into sending help.

Guillaume returns, accompanied by a fantastic creature, Renouart, who in the second part of the poem occupies the centre of the stage. Renouart is an uncouth giant, the laughing-stock of all, and relegated to the kitchen. But he is brave, and arming himself with only a *tinel*, a beam sharpened and polished, he returns with Guillaume, and in a second battle he performs the mightiest deeds, slaughters his foes, and delivers the prisoners.

This poem is a combination of the heroic and the mock-heroic type, and the fantastic deeds of Renouart must have delighted the sturdy brawlers of the days of chivalry.

A third typical and famous poem is *Huon de Bordeaux*. At the close of the twelfth century the heroic vein of the *chansons de geste* began to fail. The introduction of fantastic legends from the East by means of the Crusades, and the hostility of the feudal barons to their kings, had come about. Charlemagne was no longer the majestic monarch with beard as white as thorn in bloom whom the sun obeyed as it had obeyed Joshua centuries before. He was no longer "li reis poësteïs" whom all honored as a personification of "dulce France." His twelve apostolic peers no longer refrained from speaking their minds in his presence; they even made fun of him to his very face. Finally, the flowery-bearded king developed an irrepressible temper and the queerest of tastes. An example of this transformation is found in *Huon de Bordeaux*, in which Auberon, better known to us as the Oberon of Shakspere, for the first time makes his appearance. The most ancient form of this poem in existence, by an author unknown to us, was written at the end of the twelfth or in the thirteenth century, at the time of the great vogue of the Romances of the Round Table. Its hero travels through magic lands on an extravagant errand, rescues on his way a beautiful cousin from a castle inhabited by a dreadful giant and defended by monstrous copper sentinels whose murderous flails cut down all who attempt to enter, and crosses the sea, like Arion, on a dolphin's back.

The poem begins by relating how Huon and his younger brother Girard were waylaid and attacked by Charlemagne's favorite son Charlot, while on their way from Bordeaux to take the oath of allegiance to the emperor. Huon, having killed Charlot in self-defence, was condemned by his irate sovereign to make an expiatory journey to the court of the Admiral or Emir of Babylon. There he was to kiss the Admiral's beautiful daughter on the mouth, in presence of the whole court, and

bring home as proof of his journey a lock of the Admiral's beard and four of his teeth. Huon was obliged on his journey to pass through a wood belonging to the fairy king Auberon, who was "plus biaus que solaus en esté." The beautiful dwarf conceived a strong friendship for Huon and presented him with a magic cup capable of furnishing wine to a whole army, but the contents of which glided from the lips of those stained by mortal sin. He also gave to Huon an ivory horn by which he could be summoned at the head of an army of a hundred thousand men. With the help of these magic implements and continual aid from the fairy king Huon succeeded in his mission and brought home to France for his bride the fair princess Esclarmonde, as Jason found Medea. The quest of the Saracen princess is a familiar *motif*. On arriving at Bordeaux, Huon found that his brother Girard had turned traitor and had accused him of treachery to the emperor. Huon was on the point of being put to death when Auberon, appearing like a *deus ex machina*, disclosed Girard's wickedness. Thereupon Charlemagne reinstated Huon in his duchy, whence he was summoned later to Auberon's kingdom. The fairy king, feeling that his end was near, named Huon as his successor in his magic realm.

It is obvious from a comparison of *Huon de Bordeaux* with earlier *chansons de geste* that the whole journey to the East, including the episodes of Auberon, is an addition to an earlier poem which consisted probably of the death of Charlot alone. The fairy king, who is of Germanic origin and connected with Alberich of the *Nibelungenlied*, is a creature of the religious imagination, offspring of the age in which the marvellous held high sway and good works waited upon it. Auberon thus has a distinctly moral nature, is of beneficent character, and, although of purely imaginative origin, is a king of fairyland only because possessed of magic powers. He works for righteousness as far as the activities of his time, not the cloistral piety, understood it. He has moral dignity, and his weaknesses are human, not elfish. He commands and protects chastity and truthful-

ness, and punishes lapses of virtue. He weeps like a Christian gentleman and not like a dewdrop-manufacturing fay, for he weeps for sin and suffering and not because a lily has blown down or the stars grown dim or love gone wrong. It is certain that if the romance did not state Auberon's height as that of a dwarf of three feet, no reader's imagination would conceive him otherwise than as a tall young man, strong with valor and shining with beauty.

No incident indicates possession of what the world now accepts as a dwarfish nature. Perhaps it was for this reason that he was represented not as a real dwarf, but as one who had ceased to grow when a beautiful child. He has nothing spiteful; as a man he is celibate, even anchorite, for he has not a queen, Titania remaining unborn until a later writer fathered her. He feels both pity and remorse, he loves Huon like a brother, and he falls into very human rages now and then, as any Christian gentleman may, but he is never a spiteful elf.

CHAPTER III

ROMANCE

IN the Romances of the Round Table we come upon one of the most confusing and most discussed problems of mediæval French literature.[1] The usually accepted view is that mainly of Gaston Paris: a Celtic origin and Anglo-Norman transmission. According to this theory Arthur was an early Cymric chieftain living in the fifth century, who fought against the Saxons. His tradition was preserved until the composition of the *Historia Britonum*, an anonymous work of the ninth century attributed to a certain Nennius. Towards 1136 Geoffrey of Monmouth wrote his *Historia Regum Britanniae*, adapted about 1150 by Wace in the *Roman de Brut*, containing Celtic tales concerning Arthur and a history of the British kings before the Saxon conquests, from Brutus, grandson of Æneas. Geoffrey's history is by no means the only source of the Arthurian cycle and makes no mention of the Round Table or the Coming of Arthur. The material was transmitted by Breton lays in the form of songs and stories, carried perhaps almost simultaneously from Wales to England and from England to the continent by Welsh and by Anglo-Norman bards and story-tellers, as lays and poems. From the middle of the twelfth to the middle of the thirteenth century the stories spread in England and in France. The oldest poems are connected with the Tristan legend of Celtic origin and perhaps of English transmission, the fragments of Bérol, not later than 1150, and of Thomas, not

[1] The various theories as to the origin of the Romances of the Round Table are set forth in Voretzsch's *Einführung*, Chap. IX, Sect. 10. — The usually accepted view today is transmission from Brittany and also through Anglo-Norman.

later than 1170, though the date of Bérol is now sometimes placed in the last decade of the twelfth century. The first French writer of importance is Chrétien de Troyes who takes this material as his starting-point and, making use of octosyllabic couplets, by the addition of much of his own invention develops his long and elaborate poems of polite society of the France of Louis VII and Philippe-Auguste.

A partly discarded view increases the English share: the prose stories are ante-dated and put before the verse, though that is a very unusual order, and then attributed to Walter Map or Mapes. The Celtic side of the theory of Gaston Paris is increased by Celtic students. Through Geoffrey the French early became better acquainted with what they already knew. Zimmer, however, maintains that the Anglo-Norman-Celtic theory in this shape is totally at fault. The method of transmission to France from England is doubtful, and racial hate would prevent the passage from Wales to England. The true source is rather in Armorica or continental Brittany, whence the legends went both to the neighboring France and to Great Britain. The mention of Broceliande, for instance, is purely Armorican. Foerster's view is in harmony with the last, and he states the arguments against the Anglo-Norman theory more fully than any one else. He emphasises the idea that the French Arthurian poems are nearly original or modern and contain little of primitive tradition. The popularity of the Arthurian epic, then, as it appears, is mainly as an expression of a new social and literary ideal, given in works coincident with the decline of the *chansons de geste*, wherein the character of the ruler is diminished in importance and becomes merely a connecting-link for the romantic achievement of a knightly society of poetry and of the imagination. Of this society the setting or environment only is Celtic and the spirit is almost totally modern. Such a theory, it is obvious, very largely increases the part attributed to a poet like Chrétien de Troyes.

The unprejudiced reader finds it difficult to deny the impor-

tance of Celtic tradition, at least as a starting-point. The mystic sadness, the spirit of melancholy and brooding, the passionate love element, are all in harmony with what we are taught is to be found in the Celtic nature and are characteristic of the older fragments in our possession. It is true that in the hands of Chrétien de Troyes the spirit of the *matière de Bretagne* is very distinctly modified into an exemplification of the social graces and of courtly love.

The Tristan legends belong to two groups, one represented by the Bérol fragment and the other by the portions of the poems of Thomas, both reconstructed with the aid of foreign translations by modern scholars. The story is one of the strongest examples of passionate and romantic love in literature. Certain elements resembling other myths, such as the stories of Theseus and of King Midas and the long ears, suggest influences from other races; but the gist of the tale, after all, depends on the masterful passion of the young couple Tristan and Iseult, a love which nothing can thwart, law or convention, a love which is one of adulterous passion, but purified by its own strength. It is about the origin of this *motif* that discussion turns.

Tristan is the nephew of King Marc of Cornwall, sent to Ireland to get the fair Iseult who is to be his uncle's bride. On the return journey they drink by mistake a magic potion which had been prepared by Iseult's mother to win King Marc's love. From that time overpowering passion holds them, in spite of the duties of marriage or the sufferings of the lovers in their guilty wandering life.

The element of romantic love is also found in the lays of Marie de France, who wrote about 1175. She was a French woman living at the thoroughly French court of Henry II of England to whom her lays are dedicated, as her fables are to William Longsword, son of Henry and of Fair Rosamund. In this courtly society was felt the influence of Eleanor of Aquitaine and the spirit of the Provençal troubadours. Marie de France became familiar with the sentimental side of love to which her

sex made her susceptible and which she expresses in her lays. These are of Celtic origin, some perhaps Armorican, others Welsh. M. Bédier's theory of their transmission is that the travelling bards recited in bad French short narratives interspersed with sung interludes, as in *Aucassin et Nicolette*, and that Marie put the narrative part into literary form by versifying the tales, allowing the less easily adaptable lyrical element to drop out. These tales, one of which, the *Chèvrefeuille*, is connected with the Tristan legend, are stories of love among lords and ladies, a love more refined than in the rough passions of the *chansons de geste* or the violent frenzy of the Tristan legend. They tell of the married woman who loves a knight and tells her lord that she goes to listen to a nightingale; whereupon the cruel husband snares one of these birds and throws the innocent and bleeding thing at his wife, who then sends it to her lover in token that they must no longer meet; the lady shut in a tower by a jealous husband and loved by a knight who visits her in the form of a beautiful bird (*Yonec*), as in the tale of the *Oiseau bleu;* the knight who by a chain of circumstances is led to marry two wives to both of whom he is faithful, who both love him and honor each other (*Eliduc*).

Contemporary with and a little before Marie de France is Chrétien de Troyes, the greatest author in the French Arthurian cycle and one of the most important writers in French literature, both for his influence and the qualities of his new style. Chrétien was probably born at Troyes in Champagne and was well educated. His early writings, which have been mostly lost,[1] included adaptations and translations from Ovid and others upon unknown subjects, among them one on King Marc and Iseult *la blonde*, directly or indirectly connected with the Tristan legend. He travelled in England and died, according to

[1] The anonymous *Ovide moralisé* of the end of the thirteenth or beginning of the fourteenth century, long attributed to "Crestien le Gouays," incorporates the story of Philomela under the name *Philomena*. This episode is now assigned to Chrétien de Troyes.

Gaston Paris, in 1175 when only about forty years of age. Foerster makes him live longer. Those poems which have been preserved are, besides a doubtful *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, the romances *Erec*, *Cligès*, *Lancelot* or the *Chevalier de la charrette*, *Yvain* or the *Chevalier au lion*, and *Perceval* or the Grail poem.

Chrétien de Troyes made a deep impression on mediæval romance. He is distinctly a stylist, composing works destined to be read at leisure or often reread aloud rather than, like the *chansons de geste*, to be sung by the travelling minstrels. His language, though often monotonous to the modern reader, shows a desire to produce a definite effect through choice of expression, an endeavor which sometimes falls near virtuosity and preciosity, *pointes* and plays upon words.

Chrétien plans his stories with definite plot and tries to keep curiosity awake by mystery in the development and by long concealment of the hero's real name. He is a psychologist in his study of emotion and his presentation of love which becomes the subject of analysis and dissertation and passes into court gallantry, of which Chrétien is the chief representative in the literature of Northern France. This feature of his writings he himself partly attributes to the influence of Marie de Champagne, daughter of that Eleanor of Aquitaine already mentioned in connection with Henry II, by her first marriage with Louis VII of France. It was through this princess that the spirit of the troubadours became fashionable in the north, and the code of gallantry of which we have a good example in the work *De amore*, written in Latin between 1180 and 1220 by Andreas Capellanus (André le Chapelain). This very unexpected work on the part of a cleric is connected with the now exploded theory of the judgments of the Courts of Love in the Middle Ages, in which some critics believed. It presents, at any rate, the theory that the true courtly love existing between man and woman is between the lady and her knight, even when the lady is married to another man. This is a form of adultery: thus the *motif* of the contemporary French novel is as old as the

Middle Ages. True love should be illegitir
the lady is all powerful to indulge her whim
submit, for it is this love which will make hir

The exposition of this love-spirit varies
works and increases as he goes on writi
the Griselda story of the innocent and perse
tells of the love of a youth and a maiden faithful to
though the latter, Phénice, has been obliged to wed
uncle, the emperor of Constantinople. She escapes at last by magic herbs which bring on a simulation of death, as in *Romeo and Juliet*. The general plot reminds one somewhat of the Tristan story, though the adulterous love of youth and maiden is toned down from passion to emotion to such an extent that Foerster looks on the whole poem as an "Anti-Tristan." The amorous dialogue and the amorous monologue, showing the influence of Ovid, and various forms of the psychology of love are here developed.

The *Chevalier de la charrette* or *Lancelot* (finished by another writer, Godefroi de Lagny) shows particularly the influence of the prevalent theories of love, the amours of Lancelot and Guinevere, and the story of the knight obliged through love to degrade himself by riding in an unknightly cart. The *Chevalier au lion* is still more fanciful on account of the enchanted wood of Broceliande, a magic fountain, a mysterious knight, a trusty lion. It somewhat resembles the *roman d'aventures* in which a knight, after strange experiences, rescues a lady.

Such is the spirit of Chrétien de Troyes. In him we find a cultivated writer:

> Par les livres, que nous avons,
> Les fais des anciens savons
> Et del siecle, qui fu jadis.

He expresses the tone of prevalent social ideals of chivalry: his hero will be *preu* and *cortois* and ready to do largess or to perform brave deeds. Love is his main topic: he writes for women and is fond of describing beauty and the adornments of

Gastoilet. He scorns the lower classes: "uns cortois morz" Foretter than "uns vilains vis." His plots are imperfect according to modern views, but were well suited to the unsophisticated readers of his day. His style is often graceful, but sometimes falls into affectation and trifling. About the names and the scenery of Arthurian legend, which often plays a very insignificant part in his poems, he built a world of romance. There the life, remote as it seemed, expressed the social ideals, though not always the actual realities, of the courtly set of which he was the poet.

But still another work by Chrétien has had the greatest influence on the modern imagination and has grown into one of the world's most cherished symbols of idealism: the Holy Grail.

The origin of the Grail may go back to heathen folk-lore. In Chrétien's *Perceval* the author, taking some earlier legend as starting-point, veils the meaning and form of the Grail for literary purposes in mystery, then dies before finishing his poem and explaining his secret. With his successors it is endowed with mystical qualities which the practical Chrétien probably never intended, and becomes a wondrous stone of precious properties (Wolfram von Eschenbach), imparting life and immortality, the vessel in which Christ's blood was received as he hung upon the cross, or the dish used by him at the Last Supper. By an accretion of symbolism and idealism it has remained in literature until the days of R. S. Hawker, Tennyson, and Wagner. Closely connected with it is the search for perfection, whether the desire for knowledge of a Faust or the quest for the blue flower of German Romanticism.

Chrétien's *Perceval* is a poem of chivalry. The hero is a youth brought up in retirement and ignorance by a widowed mother, to keep him from the dangers of knighthood and men clad in armor. But one day he sees noble beings with shining weapons, beautiful as angels. He is ambitious to follow and sets forth on his wanderings in spite of his mother who clothes him in linen and leather to make him ridiculous and bring him home.

Gradually he learns experience and is dubbed knight, being instructed in charity and piety. One of the counsels given him is to avoid asking too many questions. In the course of his adventures he learns true love by the rescue of a distressed damsel; he visits the Castle of the Fisher King, where pass before him in procession a wonderful sword, a lance dripping blood, a ten-branched candlestick, and the mysterious "graal," borne by a maiden. Perceval, whose name even to this point has not been revealed by the author, mindful of his mother's advice, does not dare to ask the significance of this Grail. The consequences are unfortunate, for the question would have healed the sufferings of the Fisher King.

Chrétien's hero has many other adventures, but the narrative was unfinished by its author. The poem received different continuations and endings in which Gauvain (Gawain) continues prominent, by Gaucher de Denain, Mennecier, and Gerbert. It is in the later parts that the Grail begins to acquire a mystic character and becomes the dish in which Joseph of Arimathea received the blood of Christ.

Other writers dealt with the story of Perceval and the Grail. The most important was Robert de Boron at the beginning of the thirteenth century, who united the Grail stories more definitely with the Round Table. Robert wrote a *Perceval*, lost in its original form, which, often contradicting Chrétien, told of the final winning of the Grail by Perceval and the end of the Arthurian world of legend. This poem was preceded by one on Joseph of Arimathea and the early history of the Grail, and one on Merlin. Finally, by other writers, the heroes were connected with the Quest for the Grail. Perceval gave way to Galahad, the chaste son of the guilty Lancelot. Some of these stories exist only in prose or in foreign renderings.

Thus the Grail legend, made up of so many sources, tells in its French form the tale of the vessel used at the Last Supper, in which Joseph of Arimathea receives the blood of the Christ. It is brought to England and becomes the object of the Quest,

as the Crusaders sought the Holy Sepulchre, by knights of whom the chief are Perceval and Galahad. The latter is the pure knight who achieves the Quest. The growth of the mystic symbolism in the successors of Chrétien is obvious, and the superimposition of a monastic ideal of chastity over the inventions of the mundane poet is interesting. It has been well pointed out that in the Arthurian cycle "there was room for knights of the Holy Ghost and knights of a Lady's garter." The matter of Brittany centres about Tristan, Lancelot, and the Grail. The treatment ranges from sensual realism to mysticism. Chrétien, the French society poet, tells the stories in a mundane manner.

The most important poet who may be classed with Chrétien de Troyes was his contemporary Gautier d'Arras, author of *Eracle* and *Ille et Galeron.*

The *matière de Bretagne* was not the only one to interest mediæval readers. A large portion of the subject of romance had a more directly literary origin and was based on antiquity. Greek and Latin history and legend, as well as Oriental folk-lore, formed the main content of this cycle, known as that of antiquity. As Arthur was the centre of the Celtic romance, the literature of gallantry and courtesy, so Alexander stood forth in this cycle as the model of *largesse*, the generous lord of feudal life. Near him stand, though with different characteristics, the companion figures of Caesar the conqueror and of Hector the pattern of virtues, modest, valiant, wise, and calm.

With the exception of Virgil and Ovid this literature is almost entirely based upon authors long since relegated to second or even to lower rank. The name of Virgil kept much of the glamor which, as a prophet of the coming of Christ and a magician or oracle consulted through the *sortes Virgilianae*, he had gained in the early Middle Ages. Statius, too, was honored partly because he was thought to have been a Christian, and the vehemence of Lucan pleased an age given to crudeness even in the midst of its refinement. Ovid, on the other hand, attracted

women by his tales of love and metamorphosis, and men by the opportunity which his stories afforded for moralising and instruction. The *Æneid* of Virgil, the *Thebaid* of Statius, the *Pharsalia* of Lucan, and of Ovid the *Heroides* and the *Metamorphoses* (as moralised by "Crestien le Gouays" and in Latin by Pierre Bersuire in the fourteenth century), are for our purposes the chief sources of this literature.

But the Middle Ages added other works which at times almost outbalanced these writings. Owing to the trifling knowledge of Greek, Homer was only a name. There existed, however, two Latin texts of uncertain origin, but probably derived from some Greek originals, known as *Dares Phrygius* and *Dictys Cretensis*. As preserved to us the Dictys narrative is the longer, but the writers of mediæval epic may have known a still longer *Dares* lost to us. The two works purported to relate the siege of Troy from the standpoint of besieger and besieged. Dictys of Crete belongs to the invading host and Dares of Phrygia is in the beleaguered city. To the uncritical mind of the Middle Ages these narratives by "eye witnesses," wretchedly composed as they are, seemed more credible than the works of Homer, writing a hundred years or more after the events described. Thus *Dares* and *Dictys* are the starting-points of much of the Trojan material of the Middle Ages.

A point of departure for the Alexander legend is the *Pseudo-Callisthenes*, a compilation going back to the first years of the Christian era and written in Greek in Alexandria, itself a compendium of legendary lore on the Macedonian conqueror and known in the Latin renderings of Julius Valerius (with its ninth century abridgment or *Epitome*), and "Leo archipresbyter," or the *Historia de proeliis* of the tenth century. Besides these there were the so-called "Letter of Alexander to Aristotle" on the wonders of India, the "Correspondence" of Alexander and Dindimus, king of the Brahmans, a brief rhythmic abecedary poem on Alexander, and the *Iter ad Paradisum*. These

compilations are full of marvels, the Alexander material representing a fantastic imagination quite as striking as the fairy devices of the Arthurian cycle and the mixture of realism and necromancy in the narratives of Thebes and Troy. For magic was believed in, and its use was not inconsistent with a realistic treatment in fiction.

As a matter of fact, the people of the Middle Ages looked upon the antiquity of Greece and Rome as something very like their own times. They were people of strong individuality and appropriated the idea of antiquity or gave it a veneer of their civilisation by playing with the narratives of Eastern marvels brought to the Western world through the Crusades. The picture of life is then of the Middle Ages, and we pass among the knights and ladies of the twelfth century, amid buildings of that age, turreted castles and fortresses. Calchas is a bishop, warriors fight on horseback instead of in chariots.

The greatest writer in this cycle was Benoît de Sainte-More of Champagne or of Touraine, who about 1160–1165 wrote the *Roman de Troie* and perhaps, a little later, a *Chronicle* of the dukes of Normandy. The *Roman de Troie* is a poem of about thirty thousand lines in octosyllabic rhyming couplets drawn from the sources suggested, and itself one of the most influential works of the Middle Ages. For, though the work of Benoît himself was soon equalled in fame by a Latin rendering in the thirteenth century by Guido delle Colonne of Messina, which spread through Europe and furnished material to Boccaccio, as well as the episode of Troilus and Cressida to Chaucer and Shakspere, the story of the loves of Troilus and the fickle Briseida, as Benoît calls her, is one of the great contributions to modern literature. The tale of the origins of Rome is continued in the *Enéas*, of about ten thousand lines, by an unknown author writing almost at the same time as Benoît or perhaps a little before, who partly paraphrases Virgil and partly indulges his own fondness for anecdotes and descriptions. Another Roman narrative is the *Jules César* of Jacot de Forest, written in the

second half of the thirteenth century, inspired by Lucan indirectly through a prose narrative of Jehan de Thuin. The *Roman de Thèbes*, based on Statius and, until recently, often attributed to the author of the tale of Troy which it preceded by a few years, had certainly the merit of anteriority, and was perhaps the first to draw attention to the legends of the ancient world.

The story of Alexander is told in a poem in lines of twelve syllables by Lambert le Tort and Alexandre de Bernay or de Paris and Pierre de Saint-Cloud. It was preceded by poems in ten syllables by the clerk Simon, and before that in Provençal by Albéric de Besançon or rather Briançon. From the version in twelve syllables comes the name of the modern Alexandrine metre.

Many other legends, often love romances derived from antiquity or at any rate from Hellenistic and Byzantine Greece modified by the Orient, were popular in the Middle Ages. Sometimes the tales were incorporated in the legends of hagiography, sometimes they were independent narratives. One of the most famous was the story of *Floire et Blanchefleur*, telling the love of two children, which has been called the "Paul and Virginia" of the Middle Ages. Another form of the same *motif* is one of the masterpieces of mediæval literature, the "chante-fable" *Aucassin et Nicolette*, of the twelfth century or in the present form *perhaps* of the thirteenth, in prose interspersed with songs.

Summing up our study of epic and romance, it may be said that French mediæval narrative poetry is the expression of the religious, political, and social ideals of the time: Christianity, feudalism, and chivalry. The national epic is the embodiment of feudalism, in which the emperor Charles, representative of God and defender of the Faith, appears surrounded by his wise and brave peers, *preux* and *sages*, almost like Christ and the apostles, and no irreverence was thought. He protects his fatherland against the Saracen invader; his wisdom is infinite.

In the Arthurian cycle the touch is lighter. We are in a

world of romance, of sentiment, intended for the delectation of women. The heroes are *preux* as before, but the ideal is *courtoisie*. Arthur and his new peers of the Round Table are the knights of gallantry and devotion, of religious chastity and of mundane love or sensuality. They are noble in demeanor, brilliant in raiment, radiant in their glittering armor, and confident in their loving heart and trusty sword. Many are knights errant whose duty is to win love by hard met adventure. The Grail brotherhood like the new Templars are knights of a True Faith, as Charlemagne was, but their worship is sophisticated and finds vent in symbols of deep mystery. At the same time the worship is of woman, who has encroached upon the devotion of man, just as in the Church the Virgin encroached upon the worship of God and of Jesus, though we shall not say with Michelet that "Dieu avait changé de sexe." The service of chivalry is, therefore, partly religious in its fealty to the Church, in its ordination, its rites, and worldly in its cult of woman and her beauty. The ideal of the epic is masculine. The ideal of romance is feminine.

This differentiation does not apply to the late *chansons de geste*, which become romantic too, nor is it so true of the cycle of antiquity which is, on the whole, exotic, except in so far as the memories of the Crusades made the Orient a home of adventure and of romance. In the stories of antiquity we have love, too, to which even the greatest succumb, as in the amorous misadventures of Aristotle and of Virgil. But to a writer like Benoît de Sainte-More love is a weakness and source of woe, as it caused the fall of Troy and brought tribulation to faithful Medea, to brave Achilles, and to the goodly knight Troilus.

CHAPTER IV

LYRIC POETRY

THE origins of French lyric poetry are obscure,[1] and even the specimens of mediæval literature preserved to us do not represent the early forms. We hear, but do not know much, of primitive satirical or religious songs. It is surmised that the lyric matter is largely derived from the early spring festivities, or celebrations of the *renouveau* called the *chants de mai*, of which, indeed, we have actual descendants in the popular May-day festivals and crownings of the May-queen known to children of today. It was suggested by Gaston Paris that in remote days spring songs and dances became popular among the maidens and married women who, indulging for a brief period in harmless and playful Saturnalia, sang of love and emancipation from convention and restraint, perhaps with a freedom of speech which might seem surprising to those who forget the absence of reticence in olden times and the somewhat similar nature cult in the songs of the Athenian rural celebrations portrayed in the *Acharnians* of Aristophanes. These songs of spring, or *reverdies*, developed, if the theory is well founded, as a combination of dances and songs of May and calls to love by girls. Perhaps in some borderland between north and south, in Poitou or Limousin, in the vicinity of those districts where courtly life and love were to have their home, these songs gradually acquired a more aristocratic form and thus gave rise to the great outburst of courtly lyric poetry of the south, the

[1] As in the case of epic and of romance the theories concerning the origins of lyric poetry may be found summarised in Voretzsch's *Einführung*, Chap. V.

songs of the troubadours, destined later to be carried all over the continent of Europe. The earliest choruses or rounds, of which we have no actual representatives, were cultivated all over France, but perhaps even more in the north than in the south. Then they rose to popularity in a new literary form in the south, whence they spread once more over the land.

Leading authorities upon early lyrical poetry, such as M. Jeanroy, divide the literature into objective and subjective types. The former of these, more purely autochthonous in the north though modified by the south, retains the predominance of the feminine element, as in the old May songs, and includes character poems with a dramatic element or opposition of persons expressed or hinted at. The literature is more popular and woman is the centre. The subjective poetry expresses the emotions of the courtly and sophisticated troubadour as he thinks of the woman he loves. The point of view is that of the man. The objective poetry shows itself in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries under the form of partly narrative songs or musings upon deeds and emotions, called *chansons d'histoire* because of the narrative element, or *chansons de toile* because they were spinning or weaving songs or ballads sung by women at their work; in dramatic songs setting forth some scene; and in the rounds or dance songs keeping up the traces of the old celebrations. Many of these poems deal with the woes of unhappy married life, of the delight of illicit love and longing for the lover. Of these a notable form is the *aube* or song of separation at dawn of the lovers who listen with regret to the proclamation of morning by the lark or the watchman on the tower replacing the nightingale. This is the *motif* which Shakspere uses in the third act of *Romeo and Juliet:*

> JUL. Wilt thou be gone? it is not yet near day:
> It was the nightingale and not the lark,
> That pierc'd the fearful hollow of thine ear;
> Nightly she sings on yon pomegranate tree:
> Believe me, love, it was the nightingale.

ROM. It was the lark, the herald of the morn,
No nightingale: look, love, what envious streaks
Do lace the severing clouds in yonder East:
Night's candles are burned out and jocund day
Stands tiptoe on the misty mountain tops;
I must be gone and live or stay and die.

The atmosphere of these songs is akin to the sentimental ballad or *romance* still popular among the French, and familiar in English in the songs of Thomas Haynes Bayley:

Belle Yolans en ses chambres seoit,
D'un bon samit une robe cosoit,
A son ami tramettre la voloit.
En sospirant ceste chanson chantoit:
"Diex! tant est dous li nons d'amor,
Ja n'en cuidai sentir dolor."

Perhaps the most attractive form of all is the *pastourelle*, originally the song of a shepherdess and developing into the story of her encounter with a knight who wooes her in the strain of: "Where are you going, my pretty maid?"

Ce fut en mai,
Au dous tens gai
Que la saison est bele,
Main me levai,
Joer m'en alai
Lez une fontenelle.
En un vergier,
Clos d'eglantier
Oï une viele;
La vi dansier
Un chevalier
Et une damoisele.

This love the maiden usually scorns and, without the regrets of Maud Muller, remains faithful to her rustic swain. The song is often interspersed with some melodious trill or refrain. The

charming *Jeu de Robin et Marion* of Adam de la Halle is merely the dramatisation of the *pastourelle motif*.

The subjective poetry was permeated with the more aristocratic and courtly spirit of the troubadours whom the northern writers began to imitate zealously in the middle of the twelfth century. The points of contact between the north and the south had become numerous, whether by travel in France itself or by contiguity in the remote East during the Crusades. So the poetry of the north became, in the lyric as elsewhere, filled with the spirit of polite society, of courtly love and its scholastic code. The spirit was made known by a southerner descended from the troubadours, Eleanor of Aquitaine, wife of Louis VII and then of Henry II of England, from whom came in turn the troubadours Richard Cœur de Lion and Thibaut de Champagne. The daughters of Eleanor, Marie, wife of Henri de Champagne, and Aélis, wife of Thibaut de Blois, did even more than their mother. A sister of these princes, Aélis, also the wife, after Eleanor, of Louis VII, was of a kindred feeling. These ladies welcomed the troubadours at their courts and encouraged the northern poets to imitate them. Bernart de Ventadour and Bertran de Born were in favor at the court of Eleanor, and Marie received Rigaut de Barbézieux and suggested topics to Chrétien. The current passed through Champagne, Picardy, Flanders, and Artois. Thus there sprang up an abundant literature of set worship in song. The earlier specimens were simple and graceful. But later, under the influence of the courtly love borrowed from the writings of Ovid, the *Ars amatoria*, the *Heroides*, the loves of Æneas and Dido, the stories of the *Metamorphoses*, and developed under the influence of scholastic methods, codified later by André le Chapelain, there grew up a collection of poems full of exaggerations and subtilised conceits, of euphuism and preciosity, not merely of language, but of thought, for which Peire Roger and Folquet de Marseille were partly responsible. The imitation of Provence was as baneful as the Italianism of the sixteenth century. The code

of Love, who is personified as a stern potentate with rigid laws, commands immediate and unquestioned sacrifice of self to the chosen lady, even of one's honor. This love, which is illegitimate and often furtive, a thing more easily understood when marriage was a matter of convenience without consultation of affinities, is set forth with elaborate psychological analysis. All nature partakes in it, and the very birds sing and dispute of love.

The courtly lyric develops certain forms of its own, such as the *tenson* and the *jeu parti* and others less remote from the popular lyric, as the *rondel* and the *ballette*. The *tenson* and *jeu parti* were debates or contests in song in the amœbic strain and afforded good scope for satire and allusions not directly connected with love, or the treatment of love procedure and love dilemmas, or *ἀπορίαι*. The *rondel* with its repeated refrain, of which the modern forms of the *triolet* and *rondeau* descend, the *ballette* with set form, the inchoate *lai* and *virelai* (or rather *vireli*), with the irregularity connected later with the Pindaric style, were afterwards the favorite forms of poetry. Especially the *ballade* in the hands of Guillaume de Machault and Eustache Deschamps became pre-eminently the lyric form, until superseded at the Renaissance by the sonnet.

The poets belonged to all spheres of life and sang in different moods of different things. There were Crusader's songs with warlike refrains and battle-cries of *Oltrée* (Forward), there were willow-waily tunes of love, winter songs of good cheer, springtime tunes of merry-making, or ballads of homesickness and love of country. The often quoted song of Gace Brulé:

Les oisillons de mon pays
Ai oïs en Bretaigne;
A lor chant m'est il bien avis
Qu'en la douce Champaigne
Les oï jadis,

reminds one of the modern "J'aime à revoir ma Normandie" of Frédéric Bérat or Chateaubriand's "Combien j'ai douce souvenance, Du joli lieu de ma naissance." These songs were

interspersed with refrains like "dorenlot," "triquedondaine," "dorenleu diva," or "valura, valura, valuraine," probably a relic of primitive dance songs.

The names of the lyric poets are legion. Prominent among them were Audefroi le Bastart, one of the earliest authors of ballads of sentiment; Conon de Béthune, who was an orator and Crusader as well as a *trouvère* and a writer of romance, a contemporary at the court of Marie de Champagne of Chrétien de Troyes; the Châtelain de Couci, in legend the victim of his love for the Lady of Fayel and killed by a jealous husband who made his wife eat his rival's heart; Blondel de Nesle of Picardy, linked in story with the name of Richard Cœur de Lion; Gace Brulé; Gautier d'Espinau or d'Epinal; Colin Muset, a "thirteenth century Clément Marot"; Gilebert de Berneville; and Philippe de Nanteuil. Gautier de Coinci, known for his *Miracles de Notre Dame*, wrote also religious *pastourelles*. High in rank were Thibaut IV de Champagne, king of Navarre in the beginning of the thirteenth century, the adorer, it was said, of Blanche of Castille, and Charles, count of Anjou and king of Sicily, brother of Saint Louis. To the *bourgeois* class belonged the poets of Arras, Jean Bodel, who also wrote the *Chanson des Saisnes*, author of the pathetic *Congé* or "Farewell" to his fellow-townsmen when stricken by leprosy and obliged to withdraw from the world to a living death; Adam de la Halle, the lyrical satirist of his native town. The *puys* (literary gatherings) of Arras and other northern cities, with set competitions and prizes, tended to emphasise still more the written lyric and pave the way for the writers of the fourteenth century and the *Chambres de rhétorique* of Flanders and the *grands rhétoriqueurs* of later days.

We must not forget, however, in the thirteenth century, one of the greatest poets of that time, the wandering minstrel and *jongleur*, the Parisian Rustebeuf. Little is known of his life, except that it was one of poverty and of distress. He was a versatile author who belongs to the history of the drama, of

the *fabliaux*, of satire because of his participation as champion of the University of Paris and Guillaume de Saint-Amour in the quarrels against the religious orders. But, in particular, he stands out among the lyric writers for certain qualities which few of the conventional poets possessed. Whatever the form of his poem, whether a religious song, a cry to the Crusades, a *complainte*, a satire upon hypocrisy, a dispute, or a song such as the *Dit des ribauz de Grieve*, he has an individuality which sets him apart from his contemporaries:

Ribaut, or estes vous à point!
Li arbre despouillent lor branches,
Et vous n'avez de robes point,
Si en avrez froit à vos hanches!
Quel vous fussent or li pourpoint,
Et li sorcot fourré à manches!
Vostre soler n'ont mestier d'oint:
Vous fetes de vos talons planches!
Les noires mouches vous ont point:
Or, vous repoinderont les blanches!

Rustebeuf, poor like Villon, though his vagrancy was forced upon him rather than of his choosing, has been compared to Villon for his personal touch:

Je touz de froid, de faim baaille,
Je sui sans cotes et sans liz.

The lyric poetry of mediæval France was, however, not limited to French. That country was the home of abundant Latin poetry, religious and secular, clerkly and sometimes popular, in feeling if not in language. Though it could not claim the most magnificent hymn ever written, the *Dies Irae* of Thomas of Celano, still it was the land of one who has been called the *greatest poet of the Middle Ages*, and the most productive of hymn writers, the Breton mystic of the twelfth century, Adam de Saint-Victor. Moreover, Abélard, his rival Bernard of Clairvaux, Bernard of Cluny, Hildebert, and Peter Venerable are all noble names.

But France was also the chief starting-place of an abundant Latin literature more akin to the profane poems already described: the Goliardic poetry. Paris was the home of the great university, and from Paris had spread the international guild of vagrant clerks or beggar scholars who wandered from town to town, sponging a living if possible from a Church dignitary or municipal official with whose learning they claimed a freemasonry, or as willingly rioting in tavern or brothel with dice-box or wine-jug. The quotations here given are accompanied by the versions of John Addington Symonds:

Meum est propositum
in taberna mori;
vinum sit adpositum
morientis ori,
ut dicant, cum venerint,
angelorum chori:
"Deus sit propitius
huic potatori!"

In the public house to die
Is my resolution;
Let wine to my lips be nigh
At life's dissolution:
That will make the angels cry,
With glad elocution,
"*Grant this toper, God on high,*
Grace and absolution!"

These men of more or less learning who begged and perhaps stole their living were the minstrels of clerkly society and the counterparts of the *jongleur* in the *fabliau* who, as he travelled, squandered his books in gambling and marked his passage by his pawned Ovid, Lucan, Juvenal, Virgil, and Statius. The poems roughly classed as Goliardic include, however, some by men of position who would have scorned to be classed among the vagrants, such as the Frenchmen Hugues d'Orléans (Hugues le Primat), of the twelfth century, and Philippe de Grève, a chancellor of Notre-Dame in the early thirteenth; Serlo of Wilton, an Englishman who taught in Paris in the twelfth century, and perhaps the English scholar Walter Map. The Goliardic poets belonged, indeed, to all lands and had that cosmopolitanism which their universal language made possible, so that the nationality of individual songs becomes a minor matter. They seem to have constituted an informal brotherhood, never a close-knit fraternity, with an imaginary leader or chancellor, Golias, whence their

name of *Goliardi*, derived perhaps from *gula*, perhaps from Goliath, a term which Bernard applied to Abélard in opprobrium, but which they may have taken as a term of honor. The best poems were written between 1150 and 1225. The Goliardic poets were full of the love of life expressed in pagan erotic verse. At times they composed moral, satirical, or political poems, but more often eating and drinking ballads or songs of nature and May-day pleasure like the *pastourelles*, the knight becoming, however, the clerk:

Exiit diluculo	*There went out in the dawning light*
rustica puella	*A little rustic maiden;*
cum grege, cum baculo,	*Her flock so white, her crook so slight,*
cum lana novella.	*With fleecy new wool laden.*
Sunt in grege parvulo	*Small is the flock, and there you'll see*
ovis et asella,	*The she-ass and the wether;*
vitula cum vitulo,	*This goat's a he, and that's a she,*
caper et capella.	*The bull-calf and the heifer.*
Conspexit in cespite	*She looked upon the green sward, where*
scholarem sedere:	*A student lay at leisure:*
"Quid tu facis, domine?	*"What do you there, young sir, so fair?*
veni mecum ludere."	*Come, play with me, my treasure!"*

Finally, in the poem *De Phyllide et Flora*, probably composed by an Italian, Goliardic literature has bequeathed one of the most graceful compositions in existence and unsurpassed by all the masterpieces in lighter vein on which so much praise has been lavished, from *Aucassin et Nicolette* to the Anacreontics of the sixteenth century. The poem in the form of a *débat* tells how two maidens go forth into the country together. Phyllis loves a soldier and Flora a scholar. They discuss the relative merits of the clerk's and the warrior's life and then consult Love himself who pronounces judgment in favor of the scholars. The whole poem is a work of genius:

Anni parte 'florida,'	*In the spring-time, when the skies*
caelo puriore,	*Cast off winter's mourning,*

picto terrae gremio,
vario colore,
dum fugaret sidera
nuntius Aurorae
liquet somnus oculos
Phyllidis et Florae.

And bright flowers of every hue
Earth's lap are adorning,
At the hour when Lucifer
Gives the stars their warning,
Phyllis woke and Flora too,
In the early morning.

—

Erant ambae virgines
et ambae reginae,
Phyllis coma libera,
Flora compto crine:
non sunt formae virginum
sed formae divinae,
et respondent facie,
luci matutinae.

Both were virgins, both I ween,
Were by birth princesses;
Phyllis let her locks flow free,
Flora trained her tresses.
Not like girls they went, but like
Heavenly holinesses;
And their faces shone like dawn
'Neath the day's caresses.

—

Susurrabat modicum
ventus tempestivus,
locus erat viridi
gramine festivus,
et in ipso gramine
defluebat rivus
vivus atque garrulo
murmure lascivus.

In the tree-tops overhead
A spring breeze was blowing,
And the meadow lawns around
With green grass were growing;
Through the grass a rivulet
From the hill was flowing,
Lively, with a pleasant sound
Garrulously going.

—

Consedere virgines,
herba sedem dedit.
Phyllis prope rivulum,
Flora longe sedit;
et dum sedet utraque,
ac in sese redit,
amor corda vulnerat
et utramque laedit,
etc., etc.

On the sward the maidens sat,
Naught that seat surpasses;
Phyllis near the rivulet,
Flora 'mid the grasses;
Each into the chamber sweet
Of her own soul passes,
Love divides their thoughts, and wounds
With his shafts the lasses.
Etc., etc.

CHAPTER V

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND CHRONICLES

THE earliest history deserving the name is to be found chiefly in the form of Latin texts drawn up under the auspices of the clerks in the monasteries. But these documents were for many years distinct from the popular literature, though not any more exempt from fabulous elements and errors.

The popular historical material, indeed, has its starting-point in the brief songs concerning tribal or national heroes which perhaps grew up, as already described, into the *chansons de geste*. Then, too, in those days but little difference was made between the biographies of religious or of secular heroes, so that the numerous lives of the saints may well be placed under the head of what seemed historical literature.

The earlier material is, naturally, for the most part anonymous. Later, in the long rhymed chronicles in the vulgar tongue we are apt to find them attributed to a specific author, and in the works of Villehardouin or Joinville the personality of the writer is distinctly traceable.

It is not within the province of this book to go back in detail to the *Historia Francorum* by Gregory of Tours (540–594), containing mainly the events of his own age and told with painstaking care in view of the uncritical period. Important as the ultimate source of mythical material on the origin of the Franks, to be used by poets as recently as the sixteenth century, was the history written in Burgundy in the seventh century by one or by three writers and known by the name of Fredegar (Fredegarius scholasticus). The historical material was reproduced and continued in the *Gesta regum Francorum*, Neustrian histories

written in the eighth century, while, on the other hand, the Austrasian continuations of Fredegarius were composed under the inspiration of the rising family of Pepin, destined to become the Carolingian dynasty.

There is a difference between the historiography of the two periods. In the earlier times, aside from the lives of the saints, the writings were histories, as stated, and chronicles on the model of that of Saint Jerome. In the Carolingian period the lives of the saints often tend to a more historical nature, inasmuch as they sometimes deal with political characters. Moreover, the writing of biography and annals is developed. The annals, of which the oldest are those of Saint-Amand near Valenciennes, are registers of contemporary events, first written by monks in monasteries in a very brief and abrupt form and inscribed in the calendar of feasts or computations of Easter. Gradually they developed into continuous narrative. The most important were the *Annales Laurissenses majores* beginning in 741 and, after 830, continued in France upon the division of the empire by the *Annales Bertiniani*, chiefly by Prudentius of Troyes and Hincmar of Rheims. These names come from the monasteries (Lorsch and Saint-Bertin) where the manuscripts were found. There were also chronicles such as those of Freculphus of Lisieux and, more especially, biographies. Among these were the *Vita Karoli Magni* of Einhard, the lives of Hludovicus (Louis le Débonnaire) by Ermoldus Nigellus, who wrote in verse about 824, by Theganus about 837, and by an anonymous writer known as the "Astronomer." Nithardus, the first lay writer and one of the most original, though inspired by Sallust and especially by Suetonius, told about 844 of the dissensions of the sons of Louis, being himself a partisan of Charles le Chauve, who was his cousin.

In the tenth century the only significant historians were Flodoardus and Richer, both of Rheims. Flodoardus was an annalist of his times and Richer described the early Capetian struggles.

With the advent of the Capetians history is for a while written mainly as biography or piecemeal local or monastic history, because of the development of feudalism and the quasi-independence of the principalities. It is only later, with the acquisition of power by the Capetians and the interest in the Crusades, that history becomes again broader in scope. Of general interest, however, are the histories of Rodolphus Glaber or Raoul Glaber, a mystic monk, born about 985, who believed in the coming of the Antichrist and the end of the world; of Helgaldus (Helgaud), author of a life of King Robert; of Ademarus Cabannensis (Adémar de Chabannes), who composed chronicles. In the time of Louis VI the great minister and regent Suger wrote the life of the king. Odericus Vitalis (1075–c. 1143), an Anglo-Norman and author of an *Historia ecclesiastica*, is because of his good power of characterisation the best historian of the twelfth century.

In the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries universal chronicles came again in vogue. Their chief model was the *Chronicon* or *Chronographia* of Sigibertus Gemblacensis (Sigebert de Gembloux, c. 1030–1112), covering from 381 to the author's time. Such was the chronicle of Robert of Auxerre, one of the best historical works of the Middle Ages because of the author's critical powers and sanity of judgment. It is a continuation of Sigebert down to 1211. In some of the monasteries, like Saint-Denis, compilations were made of previous writings which served as a basis for French works.

Meanwhile, there grew up a vast literature in the vulgar tongue of historical intent, sacred and profane, and taking the form of: 1. Lives of the saints and legends of piety; 2. *chansons de geste*, already treated in a previous chapter; 3. historical poems and rhymed chronicles; 4. prose histories and prose chronicles.

The religious literature began undoubtedly as early as the historical songs and was, of course, originally in Latin only. In fact, the poems of *Sainte Eulalie* and of *Saint Léger* are the

oldest specimens in French in existence, if they can be called poetry. Saint Léger was a victim of Ebroin, *maire du palais*. The life of Saint Alexius of the eleventh century, perhaps by Tibaud of Vernon near Rouen, is infinitely superior in merit. On the whole, however, these religious biographies are far from showing as much poetical worth as the popular legends which grew into the *chansons de geste*. The latter were written by real poets or bards inspired with a certain rudimentary national spirit. The religious poems, on the contrary, though they appealed to an even higher sentiment, were apt to be composed rather by clerks or under clerical influence and were more often transcriptions or remodellings of priestly legends. It is more particularly when the subjects were based on the lives of Oriental saints, where a greater imagination was brought into play and Christianity was intermingled with the supernatural legends of the East, that we find works interesting as stories and having a value that their metre, usually in octosyllabic verse, could not give them. The story of Saint Alexius is precisely one of these: the narrative of a holy man who leaves his wife on the day of their marriage and, after long wanderings, returns to his father's house where he remains an unrecognised beggar dwelling in a kennel beneath the stairway for seventeen years, until he is at last discovered at the moment when he dies in the odor of sanctity. Thus, too, the legends of Saint George and the dragon or of Saint Christopher, the giant who bore the child Jesus across the stream, have passed into the literature of the Western world together with many other fabulous tales grafted on the material of religious worship, such as the travels of Saint Brendan, drawn from Celtic sources. Still later, authors told in rhyme the lives and deaths of modern saints, whose biographies intermingle with historical narrative. Chief among these is the story of Thomas-à-Becket, by Garnier de Pont-Sainte-Maxence, a wandering scholar and contemporary of Chrétien de Troyes, who tried to give an impartial yet vivid and dramatic narrative of his hero's life and death.

Above even the lives of the saints we must place the stories devoted to the Virgin Mary. The miracles of Our Lady are numerous and popular in all branches of literature in the Middle Ages. Particularly in the history of the drama they are the chief manifestation of the serious theatre during the fourteenth century. In the pseudo-biographical or historical *genre* the chief examples are the *Miracles* of the monk Gautier de Coinci, who died in 1236, author of a vast amount of moralised lyric verse and pious narratives, to the extent of thirty thousand lines, devoted to the Virgin and her kindly acts toward those who invoked her intercession. They are partly drawn from the Latin narratives of Hugo Farsitus (Hugues Farsit) in the twelfth century. These stories, though pure in their piety, are often extraordinarily unmoral in their direct conclusions. Often the wickedest criminal is saved if he only invokes the Virgin at the proper moment.

But one of the best of these legends of the Virgin is not by Gautier de Coinci. It is the rather touching story of the *Tombeör Nostre Dame*. He was an ignorant minstrel who, having become a monk, did not know how to honor the Virgin except by executing before her altar all the tricks and tumbles in which he was expert. When discovered in his unseemly tricks by the abbot, the Virgin descended from heaven to comfort him in his exhaustion after his performances in her glory.[1] Another story, found in many authors including Gautier de Coinci, is the mediæval Faust-legend of *Théophile* who sells his soul to the devil for worldly gain and then, after years of evil living, is saved by repentance and the intercession of the Virgin.

From heroes of religion the step is easy to heroes of secular legend and characters of history. The same *jongleurs* composed sacred and profane narratives, and as the French warriors began to travel, especially in the Crusades, interest in their achievements arose and the desire to chronicle their deeds, often in a conventionalised form far remote from the truth. The adven-

[1] Cf. Massenet's opera, *Le Jongleur de Notre Dame.*

turous Normans, too, liked to hear of the victories of their chiefs and of the island which they had conquered. We have seen how the *chansons de geste* even may be looked upon as historical narrative for the benefit of those who did not know Latin. It is in Normandy that history in the vulgar tongue really begins. Connected with the achievements of the Anglo-Normans are the *Estorie des Engles* of the middle of the twelfth century, by Geffrei Gaimar, of which only fragments remain; the *Roman de Brut*, drawn from Geoffrey of Monmouth, carrying the origins of the English back to Troy, and the *Roman de Rou*, on the history of the Norman dukes, both by the Jerseyman Wace of the twelfth century; the chronicle of the same dukes by Benoît de Sainte-More; the anonymous life of Guillaume le Maréchal, count of Pembroke and regent of England during the minority of Henry III. This recently discovered work is valuable, not so much for its hero as for its own merits of composition.

The Crusades produced, among other works, the vast compilations in different versions called the *Livre d'Eracles* because Heraclius is named in the first sentence. Perhaps written in the Orient, it is based on celebrated Latin chronicles of William, bishop of Tyre (c. 1128–c. 1190). The history of France is carried on in rhymed chronicles like those of Philippe Mousket from the siege of Troy to the middle of the thirteenth century.

Prose made its appearance early in historical writing in French. Even an elementary desire for accuracy would show the advantages and greater liberty which prose has over verse. As early as 1200 preference for it was shown, and Latin histories, too, were turned into French prose. It has already been pointed out that at Saint-Denis there had been put together long Latin chronicles called *Historia regum Francorum*. These became the basis of the French translations and continuations known as the *Chroniques de Saint-Denis*, in time drawn up directly in French. The monks of Saint-Denis were looked upon during the rest of the Middle Ages as the official chroniclers of royalty.

The most famous monkish writers of Saint-Denis are Primat and Guillaume de Nangis.

But much more interesting to the modern reader are the personal chronicles: Geoffroy de Villehardouin, marshal of Champagne, author of the *Conquête de Constantinople*, was born about 1150 and died soon after 1212. He took an important part in the fourth Crusade, which was planned by Pope Innocent IV against Egypt and was swerved aside and directed against Constantinople, where the Latin empire was founded. Villehardouin, as an important official of the court of Champagne, took a leading position in the preparations for the Crusade, particularly in the negotiations at Venice by which the help of that state was acquired but the assistance of the Crusaders in turn lent for the conquest of Zara in Dalmatia. It was also partly due to the influence of Villehardouin that, after the death of Thibaut de Champagne, Boniface of Montferrat became the final chief of the expedition, which ultimately went to Constantinople. There has been much discussion with regard precisely to this change in the object of the religious war and the motives given by Villehardouin. His explanation is that all came by chance. It is more generally accepted today that there was treachery and that the Venetians, who had commercial relations with Egypt and hated the rivalry of the Greek empire, succeeded in duping or in winning over to their side the leaders of the Crusaders. However this may be, there is an apparent sincerity in Villehardouin's oration *pro domo sua* which has until recently convinced most people. Moreover, there is, in the directness and picturesqueness of his narrative, an interest which carries one along through the stories of intrigues and the accounts of the cruel capture of Constantinople, the treachery to the traitor Alexis, and the establishment of the new Latin empire of Baldwin of Flanders. Boniface of Montferrat, his rival and Villehardouin's chief, had to be contented with the kingdom of Thessalonica, and Villehardouin became a feudal lord in the new hierarchy as marshal of Romania. He never

returned home, and during the last years of his life he dictated the story of his adventures and the incidents in which he participated up to the death of his patron in 1207, after disputes between Boniface and Baldwin. From that time his life is practically unknown to us. He deserves a high place in French literature because of the vividness of his story-telling and the accuracy of his information, apart from his explanation of motives. These qualities lift him above the arid chronicler to the personal writer. He stands forth as an adventurer of the Middle Ages, but, though a soldier of fortune, one who felt enduring loyalty to his chief and honestly tried to carry out the bargain, good or bad, to which he had pledged himself. Henri de Valenciennes continued the work of Villehardouin. Robert de Clary describes the fourth Crusade also, from the point of view, not of the high chieftain like Villehardouin, but the mere Crusader, the helpless pawn in the game of intrigue.

Jean, sire de Joinville, was born in 1224. Although this was but a few years after Villehardouin's death, yet, as the composition of his own memoirs belongs to the end of a very long life, there is an interval of almost a century between the two works. Joinville took part in the Crusades in 1248 and fought in Egypt, becoming gradually the intimate friend of Louis IX there and in Palestine, returning to Europe in 1254. But this experience of warfare was sufficient, and when Saint Louis planned the Crusade to Tunis, Joinville refused to accompany him. Even after the death of King Louis in 1270 Joinville occupied a position of influence and dignity in his old age when, being about eighty, he wrote, at the request of Jeanne de Navarre, wife of Philippe le Bel, his recollections of his hero and friend. He died in 1317.

Joinville's *Histoire de saint Louis*, completed in the early years of the fourteenth century, but not all written at the same time, consists partly of personal history and partly of recollections of the early reign of the king now many years dead. As a consequence the work is unsystematic and full of digressions, but none the less a valuable source of information as to the

character of the king, and at the same time an interesting narrative. Joinville had a good supply of notes, a marvellous memory or a strong literary imagination, perhaps all three, and was able to give vividness to events which ought to have been dim even in his own mind. Nevertheless he is one of those authors who makes us see the events he depicts and whom it is pleasant to know.

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, though many forms of literature have deteriorated, the writing of history continues to improve. One can neglect verse chronicles like the *Prise d'Alexandrie* (1370) of Guillaume de Machault, or, as history, the biography of Charles V by Christine de Pisan, or that of Bouciquaut attributed to her, or even the Latin and French prose chronicles, or the Latin *Compendium* of Robert Gaguin. The historical productions of Burgundian writers in the fifteenth century will also be considered in another chapter. But with the writings of Le Bel, Froissart, and Commines we come upon real history.

Jean le Bel was a canon of Liège born in that town about the end of the thirteenth century. He travelled a good deal, and about 1357 began the composition of the history of his times, partly from personal observation and partly from hearsay. This he carried down to 1361. His work was continued in the chronicles of Jean Froissart, canon of Chimay. This author was born about 1337 at Valenciennes, and also travelled a great deal. He began by composing poetry and went to England where his compatriot Philippa of Hainaut was queen, to whom he carried a volume of his works. There he collected much information, and even went to Scotland. Afterwards he saw Italy, and then, when Queen Philippa was dead, he became the protégé of Wenceslaus of Luxembourg and Guy of Blois, who in 1373 gave him the holding of Lestine-au-Mont. There he worked at his chronicles and at his tedious romantic poem of *Méliador*, which he took to the southern court of Gaston-Phébus of Foix. After Lestine he became canon of Chimay.

The exact date of Froissart's death at the beginning of the fifteenth century is unknown.

The larger part of the *Chroniques* of Froissart appears in several redactions, especially in the case of the first of the four books, for the author was in the habit of adding material, or even of changing portions, to suit new patrons or new views. His purpose was to tell the great deeds and feats of arms of the contest between England and France since the time of Edward III and Philippe of Valois until the madness of Charles VI, but many other countries and events are contingently involved in the narrative.

Froissart has more than once been compared to a reporter or interviewer. He describes a complicated and troubled age, but tries to be accurate and honest. He incorporates into his first book the writings of Jean le Bel, and some of his most famous episodes, like the story of the citizens of Calais, really belong to Le Bel. For the rest he adds all the information he could collect from any quarter, though he often errs from ignorance of secret motives or from partiality, besides committing less pardonable sins against topography and chronology. At first he favors the English. His attitude is that of the aristocrat: as a result of frequenting the higher classes he falls into the way of scoffing at the common people as mere *ribaudaille*, good only to work and be killed. All his sympathy is with the brilliancy of court life, its gorgeous attempts at chivalry, its jousts and tourneys and artificial reproduction of the spirit of old romance, which the aristocracy of the dying Middle Age tried to bring about. The ideals of this society, in bringing to life what had never really been, were often false and vain, and the deeds of heroism and lady-service were often grotesque, but all seemed natural to Froissart. Froissart deserves chief praise as a historian because of the same personal spirit which had marked Villehardouin and Joinville, though it does not manifest itself in quite the same literary mould. Froissart can make the reader see what he describes.

Philippe van den Clyte, *seigneur* of Commines, was born between 1445 and 1447. He was at first in the service of Charles le Téméraire, duke of Burgundy, but gradually took a dislike to his roughness and ungovernable temper and went over to Louis XI whose friend and adviser he became, and who heaped on him favors and estates. After the death of Louis, Commines was for a time in discredit and actually imprisoned. He afterwards became a faithful follower of Charles VIII. He went on missions to Italy, and in his last years, which were disturbed by financial difficulties, he composed his *Memoirs*. He died in 1511.

Commines's *Memoirs* form two parts or works. The first six books begin in 1464 and stop at the death of Louis XI in 1483, the last two describe the Italian expedition under Charles VIII in 1494–95. The intervening period is a blank. Commines differs from Froissart in that he is not a picturesque narrator but a philosophical historian. There is nothing personal in his writings: his self is effaced, his *Memoirs* are a general history. Instead of dwelling with pleasure upon the showy side of life, he analyses the events he has witnessed or with which he has dealt and tries to elucidate customs and institutions. His theory of life well becomes the friend of Louis XI. It corresponds to the doctrine of Machiavelli that the end justifies the means. This theory he takes for granted, as though no excuse were needed for its corollaries in the shape of casuistry, mental restrictions, and equivocations. Commines even is constantly alluding to God and providence, and the will of heaven suffices to justify all kinds of unrighteous acts. In these respects he seems frankly immoral. On the other hand, he has the redeeming qualities of industry, loyalty to his master: it is often what the king wills that God wills. As a result, for good or bad, his works have had interest and value to certain great but crafty statesmen like Richelieu. Commines is not picturesque and interesting as Froissart, but he makes the student think more.

CHAPTER VI

FABLE LITERATURE AND SHORT STORIES

FABLE literature was very rich in the Middle Ages, because fables were a convenient method of inculcating the moral lessons held so important. The old fables of Phædrus, but not known as such, were current under the name of Romulus. There were also the fables of Avianus, often confounded with those of Phædrus. As time went on, the collections were known especially as *Isopets*, from Æsop to whom so many were attributed. The most famous, though not the only one nor the latest, is that of Marie de France in the twelfth century.

These fables are not the most significant of Marie's writings. She says that she translated her *Esope* from the English, attributing it originally to King Alfred, a confusion probably similar to that by which the Romulus of the fables was made out to be the emperor of Rome. It is scarcely possible to interpret the fables as Taine tried to do those of La Fontaine, as a picture of the times. We can, however, see that Marie de France has constantly in mind the application to her own days. What we see is mutual warfare, the oppression of the weak by the strong, the hostility of suzerain and vassal.

Everybody has heard of the numerous legends connected with the fox, and, indeed, the folk-tales in which animals masquerade as men or act the part of human beings have been favorites with children, young and old, from the days of ancient India or Greece to those of modern literary composition. The collection known as the *Roman de Renart* had the widest vogue all over Europe, as we can infer, not only from the many poems, but also from the numerous grotesque bass-relief carvings of ancient

architecture and woodwork. The tales appear in various lands and languages among which differentiation is difficult. The French ones, as we possess them, take the form of a collaboration or of independent composition by many poets of different ages between the twelfth and the fourteenth centuries, belonging mostly to Picardy, Flanders, Normandy, and Champagne, of whom only a few have left traces of their names: Richard de Lison, Pierre de Saint-Cloud, and a "priest of la Croix-en-Brie."

Certain other Reynard poems, such as the Latin *Ysengrimus* of about 1148 by Nivardus of Ghent, which may have been partly a model for the French poems as we have them, the German *Reinhart Fuchs*, written about 1180 by Heinrich der Glichezâre and derived from the French, or the Flemish *Reinaert* of the thirteenth century, form units. But the French stories are independent narratives grouped together in so-called branches of from a hundred to over a thousand verses and forming what the French call *poèmes à tiroirs*. Among them there is sometimes contradiction or repetition, and they offer a strange medley of fable, parody, and satire. The stories present the usual transformations to be expected as treatment gradually becomes more sophisticated. At first the authors merely undertook to spin pleasant yarns or *gabets* in simple good-humored style and write something like *fabliaux* of animals:

> Or me convient tel chose dire
> Dont je vos puisse fere rire,
> Quar je sai bien, ce est la pure,
> Que de sarmon n'aves vos cure
> Ne de cors seint oïr la vie.

Later the animals were made to act like men or almost to become men, masquerading, indeed, beneath the names of animals, but with the same inconsistency of treatment as in Rabelais's giants, travelling on horseback, going to battle with hauberk and lance, and laying siege to Renart's castle of Malpertuis. And finally satire crept in, which in the purely literary productions of a later date, such as the *Couronnement de Renart* by an unknown

author, *Renart le Nouvel* of Jacquemart Gelée of Lille in the second half of the thirteenth century, and *Renart le Contrefet* in the fourteenth, becomes entangled with the most complex and confusing allegory. Moreover, *Renart le Contrefet* is as full of science and undigested learning as the second part of the *Roman de la Rose*.

The question of the origin of the French Reynard stories is a complicated one, but M. Sudre concludes that the material is often ultimately that of the Æsopic traditions preserved in Latin literature and transmitted to modern times by the clerks of the schools. But, having become commonplaces, they were transmitted orally without the original morals and so were used by the new purveyors of pleasant tales who saw in them the dramatic side rather than any other. The prime elements are, therefore, really twofold: on the one hand Æsopic fable, on the other folk-lore animal stories.

The result, in the earlier "branches," omitting for the present any consideration of the later formal *Renarts*, is a vast and incongruous animal epic in which the chief character, like the jackal of India, is the fox or *goupil*, named Renart. Indeed, so popular did this hero become that his name took the place of *goupil* as the generic term for the animal.[1] Renart is at first only a practical joker and an unmitigated rascal, though proud of his vice ("Renart est molt de male escole"), a kind of Panurge, or to draw an example from real life, a Casanova. To this we must gradually add the hypocrisy of a diabolical humbug, so that the mediæval *renardie*, called in Rabelais *papelardie*, is the counterpart of that character of which the most famous examples in modern French literature are Tartuffe and don Basile, and the *paix Renart* is a treacherous truce:

[1] For a somewhat parallel case in English of the effect of a name upon an expression, cf. "to curry favor," a corruption of "curry favel" (*estriller favel*, *fauvel*, or *fauveau*) from the French fifteenth-century satirical poem *Fauvel*, of which the hero was a chestnut horse whom people tried to propitiate.

J'ai esté set mois toz entiers
Parjure et escuminiez.
Mes ce n'est mie grant peciez:
Ja por escuminacion
N'aura m'arme damnacion.
Sire, g'ai esté sodomites,
Encore sui je fins herites.
Si ai esté popelicans
Et renaie les cristiens.
Je hax hom frans et débonaire.

Renart's great foe is the wolf Ysengrin, his stronger but more simple-minded relative, against whom he wages war, usually in the form of practical jokes. Some of the devices of Renart are to persuade Ysengrin to stick his tail through a hole in the ice to catch fish and leave it there until it is frozen in, or to induce him to descend a well in a bucket under the impression that he is going to Paradise, thereby pulling up Renart in the other pail. The stories of the fox and the crow, of the fox and the cock (the *Nun's Preste's Tale*) are familiar.

About these two central characters are grouped a series of other animals: there are the wives of Renart and Ysengrin, Richeut, or Hermeline, and Hersent, who are no better than their lords and swear like fishwives: "Se l'une est chate, l'autre est mite." Indeed, Renart's chief aim is to misuse the wife of his "uncle" Ysengrin. But there is also the lion Noble, haughty and proud, with his wife Fière, vain and susceptible; the cock Chantecler and his chief spouse Pinte; the cat Tibert, the ass Bernart the high priest, the bear Brun, the boar Baucent, the hare Coart, the snail Tardif, and many others. These persons, if not mutual enemies, are at least on their guard against each other, and they feel that man or animal must live without trusting other creatures. But all have their hand raised against the mutual foe Renart.

The most important parts of the collection appear to be the *Pèlerinage Renart* and the Judgment or *Plaid* in which Ysengrin lays formal complaint before King Noble of Renart's crimes

toward his wife Hersent and his children. The animals argue for and against. Noble hesitates to summon Renart until Chantecler appears with his hens bringing the body of one of the ladies of his harem, dame Copée, killed by Renart. Noble sends for Renart who, after tricking various messengers, decides at last to come. He pleads in his own behalf, is condemned, but is allowed to expiate his crimes by going on a pilgrimage.

This episode belongs to a more mature period of the cycle when the simple animal legends have grown into a parody of society. It is, says Paulin Paris, "la comédie d'un théâtre dont les chansons de geste sont la tragédie." We are present at a regular royal *lit de justice* of the king, in which the animal names do scarcely more than veil human characters. Indeed, it is this stage which has the greatest success and popularity in the development of the Renart stories.

The style of the branches, as is natural in a composite work, is very uneven. In spite of long tirades and details which interrupt the action, there are good descriptive passages. The pseudo-epic tone in the enumeration of animals is striking, and the hearers must have laughed to hear of Renart from his tower guying his enemies, or the bad French of the mock foreigner.

In the second half of the thirteenth century we come to the *Couronnement Renart* by an unknown Flemish poet, an obscure allegory with more evident literary intent, in which Renart, now scarcely anything but a tricky man, mounts the throne by his scheming and puts himself in a position to oppress the poor. It encloses a violent satire and attack upon the mendicant orders which were growing so powerful. Renart, at one time, belongs to each order and is half Dominican and half Franciscan, wearing a party-colored garb, indicating his adherence to both cliques.

Renart le Novel, by Jacquemart Gelée of Lille, at the end of the thirteenth century, develops the satirical side and had almost more success in later ages than the original Renart stories, because it seemed more human. It is in two parts,

animated by a somewhat different spirit, the second being more critical and satirical. The struggle against Ysengrin becomes secondary, and the chief importance is given to Renart's rebellion against King Noble, the revolt of evil against good and the gradual perversion of the good. Allegory reaches a climax in the big ship in which Renart embarks: of this ship each part represents some vice or malice, and the crew are the wicked clergy ensnared by the wiles of Renart. Noble stands for the good, but a goodness easily duped. Renart ruins the king, seduces his wife, and perverts his son. Hence the author's purpose is evidently to show a portrait of his times and, under the veil of allegory, to point out the vices of the Church and clergy of his day, particularly the rivalries of the Dominicans and Franciscans as well as of the Templars and Hospitallers. The royalty, which protects the people, succumbs beneath the wicked feudality represented by Renart, and the ambitious clergy are largely to blame because of their time-serving. As M. Houdoy says, this work was one of the first literary manifestations of the *Tiers-Etat*. The work is almost as striking in the history of allegory as is the *Roman de la Rose*, and Renart has many of the characteristics of Faux-Semblant.

In the fourteenth century we find a vast collection of about fifty thousand verses called *Renart le Contrefet*, by an unknown author or authors. It is an "imitation" or counterfeit of the old poem. We find ourselves, indeed, among the characters and episodes of the first branches, but the author is a fond follower of Jean de Meun and adopts his method of constant dissertation. The work contains a history of the world and ample details of manners and customs in the fourteenth century. It therefore belongs to the type of encyclopedic didacticism in which the narrative is subordinated to the preaching. It, again, is a poem of sympathy for the poor and of hate for the nobles and expresses the *bourgeois* spirit of a somewhat enlightened type.

In the literature from the twelfth to the early fourteenth century an important but scarcely a valuable place is occupied

by the *fabliaux*. (These verse compositions, brief narratives or rhymed anecdotes in octosyllabic metre as composed by the wandering *jongleurs* and itinerant Goliardic clerks, are an expression of the *bourgeois* spirit which grew more and more important and stood against the aristocratic society literature, though it need not be inferred that the courtly circles did not enjoy the fæcal quality of the *fabliaux*.) The travelling musicians, professional amusers, as well as gossip bearers and perhaps scandalmongers, dressed up for their welcome in town or household, stories drawn from all sources, some transmitted from remote antiquity or the distant East, others perhaps based on personal observation or experience. They were meant to while away an idle moment like the short story of the modern magazine.

But, representing, as they did, the spirit of a class which was vulgar where it is now prosaic, and not having then even the saving grace of hypocrisy, they produced a deplorable result. In these so-called poems there is rarely a gleam of wit, refinement, or delicacy, hardly anything but filth, scatological or pornographic. They show the so-called *esprit gaulois* in its rankest form and have all its *grivoiserie* and mockery of accepted things without the qualities which, in the case of Rabelais, raise it to the level of true art. One can easily enough conceive a literature without ideals, but here is an idealism *à rebours* which produces the effect of the *messe noire* or the stews at a witches' sabbath. In jerky verse sprinkled at intervals with crude puns, though we may make allowances for the naïveté of mediæval punning, the rhymer jests at life about him. He has no method except to raise a laugh. This he does by making fun of prominent classes of people. Occasionally a rankling sense of injustice and of oppression adds an element of hatred to the mockery. (The chief butt of the writer of *fabliaux* is woman, who is represented as lewd, deceitful, cunning, and mulish. She appears as a Messalina of the *bourgeois* class or as a mégère *maquerelle*. Her chief opportunity for lust and deceit is with the priest who is also shown as hypocritical and debauched in

his cohabitation with his concubine or *prêtresse*. So we see the various classes of society, the *chevalerie* and more particularly the *bourgeoisie* with its stinginess and drunkenness. The peasant is so filthy that in one poem he faints at the smell of spices and is revived only by that of manure stuck under his nose (*le Vilain âner*). Or he is so silly that, seeing hot iron cooled by saliva, he tries to cool his soup by spitting into that (*le Vilain de Farbu*). The stubborn woman, when beaten speechless to make her yield, continues to imitate by gesture what she cannot say (*le Pré tondu*). The oldest *fabliau*, *Richeut*, is that of a common prostitute (1159).

Have the *fabliaux* any merit at all? The single one of realistic observation, though, let us hope, as much overdone as the realism of the modern naturalistic school. Occasionally, too, there is a poem of a different character like the *Vilain mire*, which is the story of Molière's *Médecin malgré lui*, or the *Lai d'Aristote* by Henri d'Andeli, a poem so often illustrated in the carvings of the Middle Ages. Aristotle warns Alexander against the wiles of women, but soon falls a victim himself and is driven saddled and bridled on his knees by an Indian courtesan. This episode seems to have descended through Otway's *Venice Preserved* and Taine's *History of English Literature* to the Comte Muffat of Zola's *Nana*.

The *fabliaux* are for the most part anonymous. Rustebeuf, Henri d'Andeli, Philippe de Beaumanoir are among those whose works approach literature. Toward the end of the period of production certain *fabliaux* were written in the fourteenth century by professional court minstrels of Flanders, Watriquet de Couvin and Jean de Condé. Indeed, the Rubens-like "fatness" of the *fabliaux* was well in agreement with the Flemish spirit. These later prosperous story-tellers are very different from the vagrant *jongleurs* of earlier ages. They foretell, too, by their florid style and allegorising the coming literature of the *rhétoriqueurs*.

The *fabliaux*, in spite of their defects to the modern reader,

were among the most popular of mediæval productions. The little anecdotes are found in all literatures, and some of the most famous of the stories of Boccaccio and of Chaucer are based on the *fabliaux*. Molière drew from them indirectly. The professional humorist did not die with the Middle Ages, and the *esprit gaulois* is found with more art in Rabelais, in the *Contes* of La Fontaine, in the *Contes* of Maupassant, or even in the French comic papers of today.

CHAPTER VII

THE DRAMA

THE theatre is an important point of contact between France and other countries of Europe; its origin and development are interesting as showing a close parallel with that of the Greek theatre. As in Greece, the mediæval theatre grew out of the religious celebrations.

The ancient Greeks gradually developed, especially in their worship of Dionysus, a more complicated substitute for the originally simple songs in honor of the vintage deity. For the sake of variety the chorus was divided into responsive halves of alternating song; or dialogue came in, and a single speaker placed on a sort of stage held conversation with the chorus. Then the number of actors increased to three.

Religious observance was in the same way the source of the French theatre. The mass is itself a sort of drama, in which incidents of the story of Christ, as the Last Supper, are acted. For the sake of variety it early became the custom to introduce brief innovations in the form of dialogue between the priest and clerk, or other officiating persons. At first, then, the mass was varied by antiphonal song and more particularly by the trope, a very brief dialogue, scarcely more than a mere continuation of the mass, which went back as early as the end of the ninth century. This may primitively have been mere *sequelae* or dragged notes of song which were gradually replaced by actual words and grew into dialogue. Thus developed the liturgical drama, which is the second stage in the history of the theatre, originating in the *Quem quaeritis* of the *Introit* of the Easter mass. The stages which this drama is supposed to have passed

through are fourfold: At first there was hardly any dividing line from the pure trope, the text was short, in prose, and made up of phrases drawn from Holy Writ. Then versification made its appearance, but timidly, and a few metrical fragments were inserted. Little by little, through the influence perhaps of the Goliardic poetry, verse encroached upon the prose, the liturgy disappeared entirely, and the vulgar tongue came in. Finally, the treatment became such as to admit profane and even pagan images. The various festivals of the Church were thus celebrated: the Adoration of the Magi, the Massacre of the Innocents, the Resurrection. The changes in the development of the drama were not mutually exclusive: the trope and the liturgical play both lasted on even after the regular drama was developed.

Thus, as in Greece, each innovation came in gradually and without interrupting the unity of evolution, until finally the treatment became very free, as is seen in the early liturgical dramas like the *Prophètes du Christ;* the *Sponsus* or *Drame de l'Epoux*, on the wise and foolish virgins, in the first half of the twelfth century, the oldest drama combining Latin and the vulgar (southern) tongue; the plays of Hilarius, the pupil of Abélard, perhaps an Englishman and not very remote from the Goliardics; and the dramas of the abbey of Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire.

But the drama becomes more immediately interesting and modern when another step is taken and the play is transferred from the interior of the church to the public square or *parvis* before the sanctuary. The audience is now more numerous and the clergy give way to laymen or actors.

This transfer to the exterior has taken place in the earliest drama—if ever really acted—in the vulgar tongue, the Anglo-Norman dialect. This is the *Représentation d'Adam* (*Representatio Adae*) of the first half of the twelfth century. It is a play in three parts with but little interrelation and of which one is probably taken from a liturgical drama on the prophets. The first part tells the story of Adam and Eve: First, their life in

Paradise, where are to be seen, the Latin rubric says, "odoriferi fructus et frondes, sint in eo diverse arbores et fructus in eis dependentes ut amenissimus locus videatur." We witness the temptation and the fall of Eve, the punishment of the sinners and their carrying off to hell by the demons amid the clattering of caldrons: "collident caldaria et lebetes suos ut exterius audiantur." A second act gives the story of Cain and Abel, and a third the procession of the prophets to announce the coming of the Messiah. The whole ends with a verse sermon on the fifteen signs of the last Judgment.

The next plays of interest, apart from a fragmentary *Résurrection*, carry us to the thirteenth century. Here we find the *Jeu de saint Nicolas* of Jean Bodel and the *Miracle de Théophile* by Rustebeuf, both belonging to the miracle class, and two other plays of a totally different nature: the *Jeu de la Feuillée* and the *Jeu de Robin et de Marion* of Adam de la Halle. In all these plays, however, we see a great deviation from the original liturgical drama.

Jean Bodel and Adam de la Halle were both townsmen of Arras, a place famous for its prosperity. The *Jeu de saint Nicolas* is a very remarkable play somewhat on the lines of a drama of the Romantic school. The good saint and protector of youth saves a protégé unjustly imprisoned for the theft of a treasure from a Mussulman king, a robbery really committed by a band of thieves. In the play we are carried from place to place at will and go from a palace to a tavern, from a Christian camp to a pagan army. We move among kings, executioners, and thieves. Great armies meet and fight — "Or tuent li Sarrasins tous les Crestiens" — we hear thieves' jargon and oaths even from Saint Nicholas and talk intelligible only to the contemporaries of gallows' birds like Clikès, Pincedés, and Rasoirs.

Théophile, in the play of that name, sells his soul to the devil and then, after seven years of wicked life, repents of his crimes and with the help of the Virgin Mary gets back his compact from the fiend.

Adam de la Halle gives us the comic theatre. These plays were probably brought out before some *puy* or literary society of the author's native city, but there is nothing to connect them with God or the saints. Indeed, they stand almost alone, and the *Jeu de la Feuillée*, at least, is more akin to Aristophanic comedy than it is to anything else in France at its own time.

It is the author himself and his fellow-townsmen whom we see in the *Jeu de la Feuillée*. At the beginning of the play Adam tells his father that he is going to leave Arras and his wife Marie to go to Paris and become a clerk. Once he loved her, but now he is tired of her. But one cannot travel without money, and his father is an old miser who tries to avoid giving any on the score of his maladies. "No," says a physician, "your disease is avarice, and you are not the only one suffering from it"; and he points out sundry other citizens of Arras who have the same malady. Then in lively episodes introducing a mad boy, a travelling monk, and others, the poet is enabled to speak of many contemporary events with intensely personal satire. It happens to be a fairy night when fairies come to partake of a feast set for them beneath the foliage. We hear the passing of Hellequin and his escort, a mysterious king of mediæval legend and phantom huntsman whom people have tried to connect with the Italian Arlecchino and the German Erlen-König. His courier Croquesos bears a note of love for the fairy Morgue who appears with Maglore and Arsile. But Maglore has been slighted and, like the wicked fairy of story, she tries to avenge herself. Among the punishments Adam must stay with his wife. Finally, after one or two other episodes, the play ends with scenes of joyous eating and drinking.

The *Jeu de Robin et Marion* is a dramatised *pastourelle*, the dialogue being interspersed with popular melodies probably borrowed by Adam from current song and inserted in his work. Robin and Marion are two rustic lovers. While Marion is singing, a knight rides by. He courts her, but she mocks him

saying that she loves only Robin, and the knight rides away. Robin appears and plays with Marion. Then, as he is about to gather a band of merry-makers, the knight returns and tries to carry off Marion, but without success. The rustic games begin, a wolf is driven from the flock, and the play ends with a gay dance, a *tresque* or *tresse*, in which the party caper off hand in hand, singing, to the woods.

This *Jeu de Robin et Marion* is the first example of a pastoral play and of a comic opera in France: much of it was sung, and it contains most graceful and charming lines, as for instance the opening verses:

Robins m'aime, Robins m'a,
Robins m'a demandée, si m'ara.
Robins m'acata cotele
d'escarlate bone et bele,
souskanie et chainturele, a leur i va!
Robins m'aime, Robins m'a,
Robins m'a demandée, si m'ara.

It does not require much imagination to conjure up this scene of poetry and of rustic life, the games and sports upon the green, beneath the trees, in the afternoon or by moonlight. This play is one of the masterpieces of French literature. Indeed, it is surprising to find at the period these two isolated plays, the *Feuillée* and the *Robin et Marion*. The pastoral play is steeped in poetry. On the other hand, the irony of the *Jeu de la Feuillée* is somewhat in line with the spirit of the *fabliaux*, though it is even more personal and by its allusions reminds us of the old Attic comedy.

The great period of the theatre in France does not come until the later Middle Ages: the fifteenth century is the time of its greatest vogue. But, as we have seen, the earlier centuries claim their share of attention, and the fourteenth century gives us some very interesting examples.

It is customary in France to make the name mystery, a general one. The name miracle-play is generally reserved for

those portraying the miraculous interference of a saint, more particularly the Virgin, and manifested in a particular way. The *Miracles de Notre Dame* form a collection apart and are what has been left by the fourteenth century.

These are forty plays, found in a single manuscript by an unknown author or authors belonging to the Ile-de-France or to Champagne and probably acted before some *puy* like the plays of Adam de la Halle. They are extraordinary productions in many respects: dull and tedious if we read them with an eye to depth of sentiment or psychological analysis, extremely interesting if we view them as expressions of the age and as material for the study of social customs. The sequence of incidents occurs without the least regard for what ought to take place. The problem is allowed to become more and more involved, and then, when the difficulties seem insurmountable, the Virgin appears as a *dea ex machina* and the troubles are done away with in a trice. A wicked sinner or a fair penitent, even the abbess of a convent, after committing the worst sins or immoralities, needs only to invoke the Virgin to be at once saved from the consequences of wrong-doing. The Virgin never inquires if help be deserved. It is enough to call upon her and she appears, often to do deeds very unworthy of the Mother of God.

Of course the importance of the Virgin must not surprise us: her part in religion and in literature is only the counterpart of the worship of woman in chivalry and in the Romances of the Round Table. As the knight was supposed to invoke his lady and do all in her name, so Mary filled all hearts to the extent of overshadowing Christ if help were sought. Thus the Virgin plays no moral part, much as in the religion of the lower classes of Italy today, and is ready to save an abbess pregnant by a clerk, a woman who has murdered her son-in-law, a hermit who has seduced and killed a maiden.

In these plays, and therein lies much of their interest, we mix with all ranks of society and all ages: we see all countries, for

the sources from which the author draws are manifold and extend from the legends of the saints to the *chansons de geste*. We see kings of France, of Spain, of Scotland, of Hungary; emperors of Rome, Berthe the wife of King Pepin, Clovis and his baptism, noblemen, monks, nuns, clerks, saints, judges, *bourgeois*, and peasants. The author was no inventor, no analyst of character; he often gives a sombre picture of life — he wrote at the time of the Hundred Years' War — and yet to the more sophisticated reader of today there is constantly a pleasant and amused surprise in the naïveté, the anachronisms and inconsistencies of these plays, which are by their dramatic form prevented from falling into the dilutions of the literature of the day. In *Amis et Amilles*, Amis runs a great risk from which he might escape by telling a lie. This he is incapable of doing; but he is ready to accept his friend as a substitute and vicarious liar. In *l'Enfant donné au dyable* a regular law suit takes place before Jesus as judge, in which Our Lady, acting as lawyer for one of the parties, wins her case. Finally, these plays are not without interest to the student of folk-lore, inasmuch as they often give forms of ramifying legends; thus the miracle of the *Fille du roi de Hongrie*, drawn from Philippe de Beaumanoir's *Roman de la Manekine* of the thirteenth century, involves the *motifs* of the father in love with his own daughter, the handless maiden, and the swan-maiden who gives birth to a monster or is said to do so by a jealous mother-in-law. This carries us from *Apollonius of Tyre* to Grimm's *Handless Maiden*, from Saint Oliva in Italy to the *Man of Law's Tale* and Gower's *Confessio Amantis* or Shakspere's *Pericles* in England, to *Peau d'âne* in France. It connects with the *Chevalier au cygne* and even suggests the mysterious heroine of Maeterlinck's *Pelléas et Mélisande*.

Apart from the collection described, there are enough traces of other miracles to show that this kind of dramatic and literary composition was more prevalent than would otherwise be supposed, so that it was but a part of the fourteenth century *répertoire*. And in the play of *Grisélidis*, which tells the story of

the patient Griselda, we pass beyond the limits of the stories of Our Lady.

But the fifteenth century is the period of the greatest splendor of the French theatre, a drama interesting to students of English literature because it is more akin to the theatre of Shakspere than to that of the seventeenth century. The mysteries are now in full sway, and the profane or comic theatre comes into vogue, from the moralities at the end of the fourteenth century to the farces which continue the spirit of the old *fabliaux*. The religious plays had been constantly performed through the ages and had had as secular accessories various figured scenes like the *mystères mimés*, dumb shows or *tableaux vivants* given on the occasion of some public function. After the middle of the fifteenth century especially, the term mystery designates the serious dramatic plays which had become more and more extended and complicated.

It is customary nowadays to group these plays in cycles like the *chansons de geste*, but according to a different plan. There are three chief divisions: the cycle of the Old Testament; that of the New Testament, of Christ and the apostles; that of the saints. Finally, a fourth miscellaneous division contains semi-religious, historical, or legendary plays, some of which may never have been given. All this formed a vast collection or dramatic history of religion from the creation of the world to contemporary times, for the purpose not only of amusement, but also of interesting the audience in the important events of biblical history or of recommending some pious duty. Among the most important of these plays were, the *Recueil du Vieux Testament* of some fifty thousand verses, a sort of biblical encyclopedia from which actors drew incidents; the *Mystère de la Nativité, la Passion et la Résurrection* by Arnoul Greban, of about thirty-five thousand lines; the *Mystère de la Passion* of sixty-five thousand and the *Mystère de la Résurrection* of twenty thousand, by Jean Michel; the *Actes des Apôtres* of Arnoul and Simon Greban (62,000 verses); the *Destruction de*

Troie by Jacques Millet (30,000 verses); the *Siège d'Orléans* (20,000 verses); and, in the sixteenth century, Gringore's *Vie de saint Louis*, of about seven thousand lines.

These plays were, we have seen, for a long time given in the open air without the inconveniences of an enclosed auditorium. The unities of time and of place were unknown. The unity of action might be the life of the hero, who could appear as a child at the beginning of the play and as an old man at its close. The stage could represent at once all parts of the world.

It was formerly believed that the stage rose perpendicularly like a house of several floors with the façade removed, disclosing the interior and representing on different levels different places or, at least, heaven, earth, and hell. The evidence of miniatures in manuscripts now corroborates another theory, that a vast stage was surrounded by different houses or *mansions* representing different places at once, so that the action could pass from one to the other. At the back and on a higher level was a platform representing Paradise, and in the direct foreground or at one side of the stage was a hideous and grimacing head concealing a trap-door, whence the devils and demons emerged from hell. The whole disposition was perhaps an outgrowth of the days when the plays were given in the church and the rood-loft could be heaven and the crypt hell. The enormous edifices, which from simple beginnings often grew very elaborate, were erected at considerable expense by guilds, corporations, or even by a single citizen, with the sympathy and co-operation of the whole population. The play was announced many weeks in advance by a public *Cry*, calling for volunteers for the long and tedious preparation. Just before the actual show there was a grand parade or *Monstre*, as today the travelling circus exhibits its animals and acrobats to the populace. When the great time came the whole town was deserted for a performance which sometimes lasted days at a time. And the whole audience was captivated by these long affairs, which it had taken months to prepare and which it sometimes took days

to act, but not without keeping its rights of criticism. These it manifested if the play became tedious or the buffoon, the crazy woman, or the fool failed to intervene often enough to enliven a dragging play.

In 1402 a society which became known as the *Confrérie de la Passion* received a charter from Charles VI enabling it to enact dramatic performances drawn from the Passion, the Resurrection, or other holy subjects. This official attestation of dramatic literature marks an important epoch in the history of the French stage. Once in possession of their charter the *Confrérie* became so active that soon they were serious competitors to the Paris churches. They also varied their performances by combining with the comic corporations to give united shows known as *pois pilés*. Jealousy and other motives made them move their headquarters several times, and they were established at the Hôtel de Bourgogne when, in 1548, a decree gave them definitely the monopoly of the stage, but forbade the acting in Paris of any sacred mystery. This date marks the end of the mediæval drama. Nevertheless the brotherhood did not yet give way before the attacks of the Renaissance and of Humanism, but continued to play pieces drawn from the *chansons de geste*, as *Huon de Bordeaux*, or from the Romances of the Round Table. Moreover, religious plays were still allowed in the provinces, and even in our own day religious performances are seen in the exhibits of the travelling showmen in France, the descendants of the old dramas.

As for the mysteries themselves, their chaotic vastness is to the modern reader bewildering. Sainte-Beuve criticised them severely, comparing their successive scenes to a sort of intermittent frieze without unifying principle. But he viewed them from the strictly literary point of view and hence failed to do them justice. It is true that to the trained Classicist the confusion of these plays is distressing, though a Romanticist as Sainte-Beuve, when he wrote this, should have seen, like an Anglo-Saxon, their principle better. It is true that a great poet was

lacking and that the mysteries were dull. We must remember, however, that they were plays and displays, treats to the eye as much as to the ear, performed with elaborate stage-settings and machinery, sometimes with five hundred actors, and were intended to charm by the show of rich colors and imposing groupings. They were, too, a representation of life as it was to the populace and not as the man of letters thinks that it ought to be. Beauty of verse was necessarily a secondary matter; something more striking was essential to instruct or amuse the vast throngs, by more noticeable metrical forms, ballads, triolets, or rondeaux, by the tragic and the grotesque. The kings must speak in proud and haughty language, using tags of Scholastic philosophy or fragments borrowed from the Latin poets. The biblical characters used paraphrase of Holy Writ, the people talked the slang of the streets. Nor was everything to be taken seriously: the antics of the buffoons, of the damned souls, ancestors of our clowns, or of the devils rushing among the audience with clattering pots and kettles made people laugh perchance more than at the moralities which are classed among the comic plays. And modern readers, too, may find amusement in the anachronisms and the unsophisticated taste of the authors and spectators of these plays.

The early history of the comic theatre is a little more obscure than that of the mysteries: the subdivision into moralities, *sotties*, farces, monologues, and *sermons joyeux* makes the question a more complicated one.

The comic spirit always existed in France, and we have seen that the *jongleurs*, who later degenerated into the jugglers, may have been the successors of the Latin *histriones*. But the literary form of the mediæval comedy had nothing to do with that of Rome. So far as the Church goes, we may perhaps find in the new religious Saturnalia, like the parodies of sermons, the Feast of Fools and the Feast of Asses and the general scurrilous revelry of the inferior clergy in cathedrals or collegiate churches on certain days, a prototype of the later representations of

fools or *sots*, as found in the *Enfants sans soucy* at Paris or in the countless provincial bands like the *Mère-Folle* at Dijon and the *Connards* of Rouen.

The great Parisian societies were the *Basoche* and the *Enfants sans soucy*, forming corporations with elaborate hierarchies. The *Basoche*, made up of clerks of the Parlement or Courts, was chartered in 1303 under Philippe le Bel as a brotherhood or kingdom with different officials and privileges. There were also the smaller *Basoche* of the Châtelet and the *Empire de Galilée*. These societies played moralities and farces. The *Enfants sans soucy*, or *Compagnons du Prince des sots*, were derived perhaps from the Feast of Fools, and perhaps from the actors of the *parades* or brief preliminary performances to attract attention to the main show. They were led by the *Prince des sots* and by the *Mère-Sotte*, and gave *sotties*, or farces played by "fools" wearing the traditional jester's costume: slashed doublet, party-colored garb, cap, and bells.

Sometimes the societies co-operated and gave combined performances consisting of a *sottie* to attract attention, a monologue or *sermon joyeux*, a mystery or morality, and ending with a farce.

The profane theatre was at its height in the fifteenth century, but lasted on with almost undiminished splendor, and, indeed, the farce continued until the seventeenth. The morality and the *sottie*, being distinctly mediæval types, disappeared with the coming of the Renaissance.

The morality was a sort of philosophical, or at least allegorical, play in which the vice to be chastised appeared in person on the stage instead of being, as in later comedy, embodied in a concrete individual. This, however, did not seem a defect in the Middle Ages, and there was certainly in these plays a wide enough variety of subject-matter: some were purely moral or edifying, others religious, others satirical. Such, for instance, is the story of *Bien-Avisé et Mal-Avisé*, one of whom succeeds in the world by the various virtues of Raison, Foi, Contrition,

Confession, and Pénitence, until after death he is carried off to heaven. Mal-Avisé, on the contrary, by a life spent with Oysance and profligacy in general, is directed to Male-Fin and ends in hell. Such, again, is the story of the *Enfants de Maintenant* who avoid Instruction and Discipline, frequent Luxure, lose all they possess, and pass from bad to worse until, after one has perished on the scaffold of Perdition, the other repents and returns to Discipline and his home.

The *sottie*, which is purely French, was a dialogue in which the action grew more and more important and took on a political as well as a moral character. What must have stood most in its way was its uniformity. The same characters appeared and went through the same buffooneries, with only variations of dialogue and of the externals of plot, as in many of the American vaudevilles and light comedies of today. We can understand better, however, the significance of such a play as the *Prince des sots* of 1512, by Pierre Gringore (circa 1475–1538 or 39), written with the approbation of Louis XII against Pope Julius II, the enemy of the king of France. The king appeared as the Prince des sots, the pope as the Mère-Sotte, and the people as the Sotte-Commune. And by the action of the play Gringore set forth the political events of the time and the struggles of the king and of the pope at the period of the Italian wars.

The farce had absolutely no moral, religious, or political aim: it was merely meant to amuse by dialogue or plot, the latter drawn from the same fund of humor that had given the *fabliaux* to which the farces act in a way as successors. It was in France one of the most wide-spread and long-lived of the profane *genres*,[1] appealing as it did to the humorous susceptibilities of the common

[1] Cf. in Gaston Paris, *Littérature française au moyen-âge*, § 134, mention of an early farce, *Du garçon et de l'aveugle*, played at Tournai near 1277. "Nous ne saurions pas sans elle qu'on jouait des farces au XIIIe siècle (le mot *farce* lui-même n'apparaît que plus tard), et elle permet de conjecturer qu'au moins dans le nord de la France on en jouait dès lors beaucoup, qui ne nous sont pas parvenues."

people. It expressed the *esprit gaulois* which has always been keen in the French mind. The subjects are inventions or rewritings of old stories current through the Middle Ages and deal by preference, as does the modern French farce or comedy, with adultery and deception. The stock characters are three in number: the warring husband and wife, who belong to the *bourgeois* or peasant class, and the village priest who makes up the *ménage à trois* and deceives the husband by his intimacy with the wife. This topic was not confined to France, and Heywood's English play of *Johan Johan the Husbande, Tyb the wife, and Syr Jhon the Priest* is but one of numerous instances. The spirit of these French comedies is entirely one of cruel satire and mockery; they contain no touch of the sentiment or sentimentality which add a sugar-coating of decency to the prurience of some modern French plays. On the other hand, licentious as these plays are, and the language of many of them is extraordinary in its filth, modern French critics can scarcely point the finger of scorn at them. In the modern farce the phallic element in the shape of the bed of adultery is as omnipresent as the *callibistris* of the mediæval one. The old plays were more naturalistic in their language, things were called by name instead of being named by innuendo. They were not more immoral.

And the mediæval farce is not without its frank fun: the humorous fool-coward or *badin* arouses many a harmless laugh, like that prototype of Moses with the spectacles in the *Vicar of Wakefield* who lets himself be cheated out of his eggs. He had been instructed to give them only *au prix du marché* and so disposes of them to a man who calls himself the Prix du Marché. Indeed, in the *Farce du Cuvier*, a mother-in-law story, and in *Pathelin* we have two masterpieces.

Maître Pathelin is an impecunious and tricky lawyer who by his wheedling ways succeeds in getting a piece of cloth from a draper without paying for it. When, the same evening, the draper comes for his money, he is met by Pathelin's wife who tells him

that her husband has been ill with fever for a long time. It also happens that the draper's shepherd has allowed some of the sheep to perish through neglect, and his master summons him before the judge. Pathelin is the shepherd's lawyer and advises him to play the fool at court and to answer all questions by bleating like a sheep. At the trial the draper is bewildered by the stupidity of his shepherd and by the appearance of Pathelin who, he thought, was ill in bed. He acts in such a crazy way that the judge, after vainly endeavoring to make him talk about the sheep in question (this is the origin of the saying "revenons à nos moutons"), at last dismisses the case. However, when Pathelin claims pay from the shepherd, the latter answers him by bleating like a sheep, and so the biter is bit.

The two remaining *genres* are more quickly dealt with. The *sermon joyeux* is merely a parody of the religious ceremony, as the *Venite potemus* for the *Venite adoremus*. The monologue, which has been compared with the modern *lever de rideau*, has not disappeared from the comedy of today. Its name is a sufficient explanation. The *Franc-Archer de Bagnolet*, once attributed to Villon, is a good example. The bragging militiaman, a descendant of the *miles gloriosus*, boasts of his achievements, until his courage oozes away at the sight of a distant scarecrow which he takes for the invading English army.

Of these divisions of the drama the *sotties* and the moralities, which were peculiarly mediæval, passed away at the coming of the Renaissance. The farce remained with some modifications. And, in the seventeenth century, Molière kept in many of his comedies the traditions of the old farces and *fabliaux*.

CHAPTER VIII

PHILOSOPHY

IT is often said that the period of Scholasticism connotes an age of intellectual darkness and of interminable verbal disputes. In truth, there is no time more significant by its broad range of thought, the depth and acuteness of its scholars, the important subjects which they examined. It is certain that during the decadence of Scholasticism its achievements were often ridiculous, yet under different names nearly all the problems which excite interest today were then discussed: idealism, materialism, pantheism, mysticism, ontology, in metaphysics; free-will and the soul in ethics and psychology; and the questions of morals and politics which remain unsettled even now. Moreover, it should not be inferred that the great thinkers held the extreme and irresponsible views often attributed to them. These were generally the exaggerations of disciples.

The name Scholasticism is an embracing one and includes, indeed, all who have had to do with the schools from the days of the Carolingian scholars, in which connection the term is first used, until it implied not merely masters or students, but all clerks or scholars, and comprised within its limits theologians, philosophers, men of science.

To the student of French thought the meaning of Scholasticism is above all important, inasmuch as it was in France that the movement found its growth and chief development. Its results, being expressed in Latin, were indeed universal, and many of its chief representatives were foreigners. And yet, because of the leadership of France in thought and the renown of its university, most of the foreigners lived or even settled there, and their writings became as important as those of Frenchmen.

Hence it is unnecessary and even wrong to apply the test of nationality in studying this important French intellectual development.

Another common misconception is to look upon the whole age as a single growth. In truth, extending as it did over many centuries, it represents distinct phases widely at variance with each other or at any rate easily distinguishable. For our purposes we may follow the common division into four periods: The first extended from the ninth to the twelfth century, at which time thought was fairly free and broad. The culmination of this stage was the second period, the great literary epoch of the twelfth century. The teachers in this age were Humanists well versed in the Latin authors and fond of the poets, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Juvenal, Seneca. Indeed, in Italy in the eleventh century the grammarian Vilgard, though his claims were judged heretical, placed Virgil, Horace, and Juvenal above Holy Writ. A third period is the thirteenth century, a time of technical philosophy. The metaphysico-logical question known as the doctrine of the Universals becomes important then. Until the end of the twelfth century this problem had been on the whole a literary one of grammar or, at most, of logic alone. The fourth age is one of involution, though it is also distinguished by the so-called Nominalist revival.

In a marked degree the metaphysical problems were, as subordinates or as coequals, linked with theology. The clerks or scholars were almost without exception churchmen. Hence the Church affected by its influence all the problems of intellectual activity, logic and psychology no less than ethics. And even grammar was made a part of the philosophical synthesis, for the grammatical relationships, such as cause, manner, means, often seem, indeed, to suggest not merely relations of words, but of things or their essences.

The early history of Scholasticism is, therefore, that of the gradual growth of learning in Europe after the Dark Ages, beginning with Alcuin and the Palace Schools of Charlemagne.

The first teachers, though theologians, were interested in learning mainly on its practical side, as an encyclopedic storehouse of knowledge. The first great philosopher is John Scotus Erigena or Eriugena, an Irishman born at the beginning of the ninth century, who became the head of the school of Charles le Chauve. Though hidden from us in the remote past, he seems nevertheless to have been a great thinker and the precursor of several important theological tendencies, for to him philosophy and theology become identical, and so they remained to a number of the Scholastic philosophers.

To a great extent then, the philosophy of the first age of Scholasticism is theological rather than technically metaphysical. Discussions were apt to deal with matters of faith, the questions of the Trinity and of Real Presence. Or problems were propounded as, in the eleventh century, the famous ontological argument for the existence of God by Saint Anselm, the Italian abbot of Bec in Normandy and archbishop of Canterbury, which he proved by the very idea of perfection, a proof afterward taken up by Descartes; or the same Anselm's doctrine of the Incarnation and Atonement, which in one way or another has affected Christian doctrine ever since.

And certainly, Scotus Erigena at any rate shows the beginnings of important and even divergent tendencies. As a thinker using science and reason to justify faith he is one of the earliest precursors of rationalism and the liberty of thought of which Abélard is the most famous example, and even before that he leads to the heresies concerning the Eucharist of Berengarius in the eleventh century. As the translator of the pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite and the heir of neo-Platonism from Proclus and Plotinus to the Alexandrine Fathers he opens the way for a numerous band of mystics. Mysticism is a yearning of the soul for the Divinity and, in its concrete form, a desire to attain directly by pure contemplation or passive quietism the heights from which the mind is separated by a pettifogging reason. As a logical result, if pushed too far, mysticism, partic-

ularly when united with realism, may lead to pantheism. And so Erigena made possible not only the pantheistic heresies of Amaury de Bène and of David de Dinant in the twelfth century, but also, after Guillaume de Champeaux, the orthodox mysticism of Saint Bernard de Clairvaux, Hugues de Saint-Victor, and the Victorine school of mystics in the same century. It need not be wondered at, then, that Scotus Erigena in spite of his own orthodoxy was, by the very greatness of his genius and the suggestiveness of his ideas so fertile in consequences, in later ages looked upon as a heretic and an unbeliever.

In the twelfth century a problem hitherto somewhat neglected becomes prominent: the theory of the Universals and the inquiry into the foundations of knowledge, a combination of Platonic problems and of solutions based on Aristotle's *Organon*, which was the only part of Aristotle's writings known before the end of the twelfth century.

The most purely Platonic form of the problem of the Universals, by which the validity of knowledge and the truth of the external world are guaranteed, is the doctrine of Realism, which we should call in modern terminology a form of idealism. To the partisans of ultra-Realism the idea has a real value. It is more perfect than any object seen in concrete form, which is, indeed, but its inadequate copy. This Universal was the connecting link of knowledge. In one respect, however, the Realists did not go so far as Plato, inasmuch as the idea did not necessarily have actual existence in some distant place (*ἐν οὐρανίῳ τόπῳ*), but could be, as with Albertus Magnus, immanent in the individual. But still genus and species were looked upon as having true essence or being. The most famous representative of this doctrine in France was Guillaume de Champeaux in the early part of the twelfth century. In this great teacher Realism had one of its extreme forms: the universal essence is found in each individual and is identical. Bernard de Chartres, Thierry de Chartres, and Guillaume de Conches are names connected with a strong Realist school at Chartres.

The doctrine most remote from this was Nominalism. The extreme form of this doctrine, whether seriously maintained or not, was that the Universal, so true to the Realist, has no existence, is a mere name or breath, *flatus vocis*, *mera vox*. Things are therefore linked to each other by something which is not even an empty figment of the mind, and there seems to be no hyphenating principle in the whole world. It would seem that knowledge must come to a stop. Such was not, however, the case and we may be justified in thinking that this doctrine was more elastic than Realism and hence more adapted to scientific progress in the modern sense. Indeed, we may not be far astray in looking upon the Nominalists as precursors in a different world of the modern empiricists and scientific investigators. Roscellinus, an argumentative monk of Compiègne at the meeting of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and a former teacher of Guillaume de Champeaux, was the leading Nominalist and points the way to what we should today call a sensationalist, without going very far in that direction himself.

In the twelfth century the compromise doctrine known as Conceptualism was developed by Pierre Abélard, the greatest of the Schoolmen and one of the greatest philosophers of France, a former student of Roscellinus and Guillaume de Champeaux. Abélard was born in 1079. He was an eloquent and vigorous teacher who expounded theology as well as philosophy and counted among his pupils, we are told, a pope, nineteen cardinals, and fifty bishops from all over Europe. He is famous for his love affairs with Héloïse, his controversies with Anselm of Laon and Saint Bernard, his foundation of the school of the Paraclete as a home of independent rationalism, and above all by his renowned lectures in Paris. His sudden retreat and refusal to defend himself at the Council of Sens, after he had himself asked for a trial, somewhat injured his memory. He died at Cluny, whither he had withdrawn, in 1142. Abélard, who was vain of his powers and contemptuous of his enemies, nevertheless leads the way for modern rationalism and may in many

respects be looked upon as a Petrarch of technical thought in France, just as the latter is looked upon as the first modern man and the precursor of the European Renaissance.

The view of Abélard, an attractive one to the layman, was that the Universals have a reality, but only by abstraction or conception of the individual mind. Thus he bridges over the difficulty between the contradictions of Realism and of Nominalism. Abélard's importance lies both in the independent use he made of the reason and in the form he gave to philosophy, and in devising the germ of the theologico-philosophical *Summae* or *Libri Sententiarum*, summaries of Christian dogma proved by arguments of reason.

Such were the chief systems of thought in their primitive forms. It is probably true that neither Conceptualism nor Nominalism were as yet practised in extreme shape and that all philosophy tended toward Realism, which was, moreover, the Church interpretation of the universe.

In the thirteenth century Scholastic thought may be said to be definitely organised and its problems clearly stated. This epoch is the great one of mediæval philosophy. The question of the Universals is still important, and their relation with the individual is usually solved in the direction of a mitigated Realism. But reflection extends to the whole field of knowledge and of revelation, especially psychology and metaphysics. Moreover, it must be remembered that the Platonic Ideal-Realism as to the Universals is complicated with other elements. Certain parts of Aristotle had long been known, and his logic had been used as a tool of philosophy. With the rise of rationalism, even of scepticism and the heresies of southern France, as well as the advent of the Averroistic interpretation of Aristotle and his newly discovered works, that philosopher for a time lost favor. Finally, however, the Church, finding it impossible to overthrow him, took him as an ally and, by the new interpretations of Albertus Magnus and of Saint Thomas Aquinas, made Aristotle again its agent and its helper to prove its own infallibility.

Moreover, the university had come into being at Paris and was a centre whence radiated the torch of learning: The new mendicant orders, the Dominicans and the Franciscans, revived the traditions of monastic learning and, in spite of opposition, obtained large control of Scholastic teaching. They gave rise to distinct tendencies: the Franciscans remained a little more conservative than the Dominicans.

Guillaume d'Auvergne, bishop of Paris (d. 1249), is one of the older philosophers, but is overshadowed by an Englishman, Alexander of Hales (d. 1245); a German, Albertus Magnus (1193–1280); an Italian of Norman stock, Saint Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274); a Fleming, Henry of Ghent (d. 1293); and one who was perhaps English, perhaps Irish, perhaps a Scot, Duns Scotus (1265?–1308).

Alexander of Hales perfected the Scholastic method and introduced the so-called tripartite or trichotomic division of questions discussed. Albertus Magnus, an eclectic, is the scientific and encyclopedic exponent of the vast sum of knowledge of the new Scholasticism. Saint Thomas, his pupil and friend, systematises the learning of the Fathers, Dionysius the Areopagite and Peter Lombard, and writes the *Summa Theologica* which a biographer calls "The Christian religion thrown into scientific form and the orderly exposition of what man should be." Duns Scotus, less dogmatic than Saint Thomas and more critical (the two have been compared to Leibnitz and Kant), helped to bring discredit on philosophy by his subtle distinctions, which his followers increased, and by his "flamboyant" philosophy. He spent much time on religious doctrine (the discussions of the Thomists and the Scotists were largely about it) and advocated, centuries before its adoption by the Catholic Church, the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin. He gave great attention to the problem of the Universals on the side of individuation which he determined by a person's "thisness," his haecceity (*entitas qua est hoc*), which in the case of Socrates would be his Socrateity. It was, indeed, the terminol-

ogy of Duns, in itself not worse than that of many a modern German metaphysician, and his tendency to give "reality" to the abstractions of thought, like the *hircocervus*, which made him the by-word and "Dunce" of later philosophers.

The age looked at as a whole is one of a new Realism modified by Conceptualism, less violent in Saint Thomas than in Duns Scotus. But mysticism was not extinct, and the Italian Saint Bonaventure, though more moderate than the Victorines, taught as they (*Itinerarium mentis in Deum*) the presence of the eye of contemplation besides that of reason and of the flesh. But the philosophy of Saint Thomas was the most prevalent, and is today, in its logical aspect, the philosophy of the Catholic Church.

The thirteenth century conception of the cosmos is, allowing for differences of detail, somewhat as follows: The highest and ultimate truth is that of God's divine religion, which is real. Of this the natural world is but a gross and imperfect copy or rather allegory, and religion guarantees to us the truth of the suprasensible world seen by the eye of faith leading us upward, when the eye of reason has reached the limit of its field of vision. The world has its final cause in God and the created thing tends to the glory of its Creator. Or differently expressed, from the point of view of the state mankind in its totality is a mystic organism rising from man the body to Christ the head and manifesting itself in two aspects, Church and state, the spiritual and temporal realms, the soul and the body.

In the sphere of rational truth or philosophy there is but one road to knowledge, that is by the use of the Aristotelian method. This must never contradict the truths of revelation to which science is always subordinate or ancillary and to which it tends as auxiliary. Logic is a tool of knowledge, but it is closely linked to the materials with which it deals. The implement of logic is the syllogism which teaches us a conclusion or enunciation of judgment about certain realities, concepts, or names, concerning which inference is made. This method is the uni-

versal one of reasoning and was common to all branches of human understanding.

In their concrete aspect the branches of learning were distributed in a progression through the seven liberal arts: The *trivium* consisting of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic, and the *quadrivium*, arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy. These lead up to the divine things of which theology gives the key, just as man is the perfection to which earthly nature converges. Of these branches dialectic, the art of syllogistic reasoning, becomes the most powerful and intrudes its method, and even its underlying postulates as to the Universals and the ultimate realities, into the discussions of such unrelated sciences as grammar, which is studied, not after the principles of etymology, but by arguments on the truth of essences. This "hermeneutic" interpretation of grammar is part of the mediæval tendency toward allegory: "The passive experiences what is rude; R is the rudest letter; so the passive ends in R."

In the fourteenth century came the Nominalism of William of Ockham (d. circa 1347), more a denial of Realism than a positive doctrine. It was, however, a philosophy of commonsense. Ockham, an Englishman by birth and Frenchman by adoption, in his defence of the king and his opposition to the pope separates the spiritual and temporal power as he does faith and science. In the Church he asserts the sovereign authority of the sacred writings in matters of faith, but at the same time he defends the lay state which is to rule in temporal matters as the Church in things spiritual. So, too, though a rabid logician like Scotus and as indiscreet in his terminology, he nevertheless points out defects of scientific method and asserts the prerogatives of science independently of religion. Thus the rights of reason are again admitted, and the way is paved for the recognition of experience which will come later. Logic is the instrument of reason, the tool with which it handles the materials presented to it instead of being itself a classified knowledge of realities. Nominalism is practically

triumphant during this period: with the exception of Gerson, a mystic, the great thinkers Buridan, Clamenges, d'Ailly are Nominalists.

Such seems to be, briefly stated, the history of the growth of the spirit of free reasoning in the Middle Ages. A period of rationalism is an attack on the vices of dialectic in the twelfth century as it was in the sixteenth, and as it is, to a degree, in the revival of Nominalism in the fourteenth. In the twelfth century it is the revolt of the Nominalists or Aristotelians against the Realism of the Platonists. It coincides with the great period of French literature in the Middle Ages and shows itself later in the rationalism of Jean de Meun. In the sixteenth century it was the revolt of the Hellenic spirit, as in the case of the Platonist Ramus against the vicious use of the syllogism of Aristotle, who had become the slave of the Schoolmen. In the Nominalism of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries we find the scientific spirit making violent efforts to overcome an almost inexpugnable foe in the spirit of debased philosophy typified by the Aristotle who appears in the amusing *Bataille des sept Arts* of Henri d'Andeli, a writer of the thirteenth century. The author here gives dramatic form in a sort of "Battle of the Books" to the hostility between the universities of Paris and Orléans. Along with the growth of logic and dialectic, literature was neglected in Paris and logic put its stamp everywhere. Orléans, on the other hand, preserved better the old Humanistic tendencies. The poem describes a fight between the two universities, and Aristotle is one of the champions of Paris. Aristotle attacks Priscian and, with his lance, unhorses his foe. Priscian, nearly trampled under foot, is rescued by his two nephews, Doctrinal (of Alexandre de Ville-Dieu) and Agrecime (the *Grecisme* of Evrard de Béthune), who wound Aristotle's horse. The latter continues the fight on foot and overthrows Grammar, but a host of Latin authors including Persius, Virgil, Horace, Statius, and Lucan come up. Aristotle in turn is saved only by the opportune arrival of some of his books with Porphyry, Boethius,

Macrobius. The army of Dialectic contains Socrates and Plato as well as Aristotle, but the only Greek in the host of Grammar is Homer.[1]

[1] François Picavet, in his *Esquisse d'une histoire générale et comparée des philosophies médiévales*, differs somewhat from the usually accepted views. According to him the importance of the doctrine of the Universals and the logical problems in general is exaggerated by most historians. These questions were confined to the schools. The characteristic of Scholasticism is theological discussion of such matters as the Trinity, Real Presence, Freedom of the Will, Grace, etc. For the understanding of the allegories of Christian doctrine a knowledge of Plotinus and of neo-Platonic thought is as important as that of Aristotle. There is no justification in seeking, as do Hauréau and his school, a line of filiation or of comparison between the Scholastics and the methods of modern thinkers. Alcuin was not a mere grammarian, but the first of modern thinkers. Maurice de Wulf, in his *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale*, also thinks that Hauréau exaggerated the importance of the doctrine of the Universals and traces two currents in the Middle Ages: Scholasticism represented by Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, Albertus Magnus, etc., and anti-Scholasticism, derived from Scotus Erigena and leading to heretical doctrines such as those of the Catharists, Albigenses, and Pantheists.

CHAPTER IX

ERUDITION. DIDACTIC AND ALLEGORICAL LITERATURE

THE history of French thought, as we have seen in the chapter on Scholasticism, is in the closest way linked with the history of the university. We may go a step farther and say that, thought being expressed in Latin, the history of the clerks no less than of the pure philosophers is necessary to make us understand the expression of this thought. For the teachers and the Humanists were not only the educators of the time, but had in their hands all that learning of which the literature in the vulgar tongue was merely a diluted and popular rendering. Indeed, many of the best and deepest works of the Middle Ages were never translated.

Learning in France goes back to the Palatine schools of Charlemagne, to whom the nation is indebted for so much. But Paris was insignificant as a home of scholarship. It was not until the end of the eleventh century that the cathedral school of Paris, which was the source of the university, gained renown (and even as yet we have no right to speak of any university) as a rival to great monasteries like Bec and others, and the secular clergy began to hold their own against the monks. The germ of the university is attributed to the transfer of educational activity from the regular to the secular clergy. William of Champeaux was the first great teacher at Paris, but Abélard was the first to gather followers by the thousands on the Montagne Sainte-Geneviève, away from the cathedral and at a rival school, the centre of what was destined to become the Latin Quarter; though the technical source of the university is to be found in the cathedral school of Notre-Dame rather than in the gatherings on the Montagne Sainte-Geneviève.

The recognition of the right to teach as a licensed privilege, at first obtained from the chancellor of the cathedral, and the consequent gradual formation of a corporation invested with certain privileges, is the true source of the university. This arose as a guild of teachers, acquiring a definite standing at some time in the third quarter of the twelfth century, and being under the presidency of the chancellor of the cathedral, who was not, however, necessarily a member of it. It is not until later, even, that the university becomes a real corporation, at the beginning of the thirteenth century. The first charter of privileges was granted by Philippe-Auguste in 1200 after a town and gown riot. Further steps in the early growth of the university were the gradual throwing off of the authority of the chancellor of the cathedral, in which struggle the papacy sided with the masters; the organisation of the different "Nations," the French, the Normans, the Picards, the English, under their proctors; and the establishment of a common head to them all called the rector whom the university looked to as its leader rather than to the chancellor. The masters of arts being more numerous than the higher degree holders, the rector of arts became the head of the whole university, as at Harvard the President and Fellows of Harvard College are in charge of the whole University. This brings us to the middle of the thirteenth century.

The four faculties were those of theology, canon law or decrees (civil law having been forbidden by Pope Honorius III in 1219 lest it injure the study of theology), medicine, and arts. The medical faculty was the least important.

Another date in the definite constitution of the university follows a new riot resulting from a tavern brawl. The masters, thinking that the court and city were too much under the influence of the bishop and clergy in the settlement of the dispute, resolved in 1229 to close their lectures and to leave Paris. This was a great blow to the city. It required the intervention of Pope Gregory IX to bring the teachers and scholars back, in

1231, enriched with a new and important charter of privilege conferring new rights and restraining the chancellor. About the same time the teachers, finding the precincts of the cathedral too crowded, passed definitely to the left bank of the Seine in the neighborhood of the rue du Fouarre (*vicus stramineus*), the Latin Quarter, and in many cases sought licenses to teach from another chancellor, that of Sainte-Geneviève.

But the story of the university alone does not exhaust the educational question: we cannot neglect the importance of the mendicant orders, the Dominicans and Franciscans, the preachers and the Minorites. These monks went into the world and, to increase their influence, tried to get not so much the learning of the cloistered sanctuary as contact with the immediate power which mastery of the centres of education might give. The mendicant orders tried, therefore, to obtain a footing in the university. As early as the dispersal of 1229 they had acquired a license for a teacher, and during the following years the struggle raged high between the "regulars" and the secular clergy hitherto in undisputed control of the university. The papacy took the part of the friars, thereby laying the seeds of a Gallican tendency in France which never died out. Finally the friars became thoroughly established. The two orders took a share in Scholasticism, participated in the winning of Aristotle to philosophy, with the variations of interpretation which were destined to grow into Scotism, the philosophy of the Franciscans, and the rival thought of the Dominicans, of Albertus Magnus, and of Saint Thomas Aquinas.

The method of instruction in the Middle Ages does much to explain the relative immobility of learning. Knowledge did not progress by observation of the concrete fact, and as late as the seventeenth century Molière's chief criticism against physicians is that they are not sufficiently empirical, but prefer to discuss Hippocrates and Galen to studying concrete cases. The method was to expound certain authors: the lecturer would dictate the text, then set forth his comments and criticisms.

Later teachers would use these comments, and thus in time would grow up a vast amount of material in which individual interpretations were so entangled with the original ideas that the author's true meaning was more likely to be obscured than not. In the thirteenth century the chief subjects of university study in arts were the scientific treatises of Aristotle and the *Organon*, accompanied by subsidiary works in which logic often ran into grammar: the *Isagoge* of Porphyry, Boethius, the *Summulae* of Petrus Hispanus, the *Doctrinale* of Alexandre de Ville-Dieu (de Villa-Dei), and the *Grecismus* of Eberhard of Béthune. The humane studies of the trivium and the quadrivium had been popularised by the old works of Cassiodorus and Isidore of Seville and particularly by the famous composition of Martianus Capella, *De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*. Mercury weds Philology who appears as a bride escorted by the seven liberal arts. The book in the Middle Ages was indispensable to scholars. The studies of the trivium were the most developed and most widely current in all the Middle Ages, but after the Renaissance of the twelfth century the studies of the quadrivium were very greatly broadened, and learning was made encyclopedic, and sciences rated alone today were then placed under these four simple headings. So that we find in those times many fields of interest, and studied with ardor and intelligence even if with misdirected energy. Such was the fondness for the remote or fabulous anecdote, even more than for the rational explanation. It was, too, the period of authority, of *litera scripta:* all authorities were taken without verification, and the profane authors of antiquity, such as Ovid, could prove the truths of religion. But too much honor cannot be given to the age which produced Scholasticism, the universities, Gothic art, the study of law, and a new and wonderful Latin which showed itself more pliable and endowed with life even than classical Latin and found expression in a rich philosophy as well as in glorious and sonorous poetry. This poetry, in such diverse *genres* as the hymns like the *Dies irae* on the one hand, and the

Carmina Burana on the other, has never been surpassed by any later literature. All life was rich and active in the twelfth century, it was not confined to the disputes of the theologians: it is the age of growing art, of a great popular literature, of thrilling contests between the spiritual and the temporal power, of the growth of liberty in the communes. It was an age which longed for unity and synthesis in all branches of life, the theoretical and the practical. All this activity culminated in the encyclopedic thirteenth century, when with even more art and reflection there is perhaps less spontaneousness.

In every way, however, these two centuries can hold their own with the period of the Renaissance and that of Classicism in the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries. Indeed, it was a period of even greater cosmopolitanism, when France was a lender rather than the borrower which it became in the sixteenth century; a time when all Europe shared in the common ideals of the universal Church and empire, and found expression in a universal speech, modern Latin, so adequate to all demands and killed only by the pedantry of a revived Ciceronianism. This new tendency, by narrowing the language and making it a mosaic of quotations taken from antiquity, requiring long training to use, destroyed it as a living language.

With these two centuries we connect several names of great scholars: in the twelfth century, John of Salisbury, Peter Lombard, Alain de Lille; in the thirteenth, Vincent de Beauvais. To the name of this author of a vast encyclopedia it suffices to add a brief list of works by other writers of different times to get the content of nearly all the thought of the age. Religion was based in the thirteenth century on the Scriptures, the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard and Aristotle, and M. Mâle points out that the whole content of religion and art, and therefore of serious literature, is to be found in the following representative works:

All the commentators of the Old and New Testament in the *Glossa ordinaria* of Walafridus Strabo of the ninth century.

The symbolic liturgy in the *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum* of Guillaume Durant, a liturgist of the thirteenth century.

The preachers in the *Speculum Ecclesiae* of Honorius Augustodunensis (of Autun).

Sacred history in the *Golden Legend* and in the *Historia scolastica* of Peter Comestor (Pierre le Mangeur — so called because he ate so many books), an abridgment with commentaries of religious history.

Profane history in the *Speculum historiale* of Vincent de Beauvais.

Physics in the *Speculum naturale* of the same author.

Morals in the *Summa* of Saint Thomas, abridged in the *Speculum morale* added to the works of the same Vincent de Beauvais.

Popular literature, to which most historians confine themselves, is only a repetition suited to less educated minds, such as those of women, who did not know Latin and needed didactic works in French of what was already in learned writings. In these, consequently, is to be found the true centre of gravity of the mediæval intellect. A knowledge of the learned books would suffice to make us know the Middle Ages, without the popular literature at all.

John of Salisbury (born about 1110–20, died 1180) was an Englishman who spent much time in France. He came to Paris at the age of sixteen or seventeen, was the pupil of Abélard and of various distinguished Frenchmen, and even opened a school of his own in Paris. He travelled much and rose in the favor of Thomas-à-Becket, of King Henry II, and of Nicholas Brakespeare (Adrian IV). During the bishopric of Saint Thomas he was exiled as his friend by the king, and was afterward made bishop of Chartres, in 1176.

John of Salisbury, perhaps the best Latin stylist of his time, was also a man of wide knowledge, whose writings give useful information about the state of learning and of politics in the twelfth century. He vigorously attacked the foes or detractors

of knowledge, as personified by the Cornificians, modern sceptics or sophists, who tried, said he, to decry learning and pretended to know all without study. Or rather, they wished to debase study and do away with literary style. John of Salisbury has himself been called a sceptic, but it is only because of his open-mindedness and his willingness to state both sides in the philosophical discussions of the day. His chief works are the *Policraticus, sive de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum*, on the vanities of the court, the *Metalogicus*, against the foes of learning, the *Entheticus de dogmate philosophorum*, a poem of over eighteen hundred verses, and numerous letters.

Peter Lombard (Petrus Lombardus) was born near the end of the eleventh century. After studying at Bologna he came to Paris where he rose to be bishop, in 1159. He held the post only one year and died soon after, in 1164. His reputation excelled that of all his contemporaries, and his *Sententiae* became the great source of theological investigation and one of the chief examples of method, as imitated by later writers. His plan was to set forth the question at issue, expound the arguments for and against, and then render judgment.

Alain de Lille (Alanus de Insulis), *doctor universalis* (born about 1128, and died in 1202 or 1203), was famous as a scholar, teacher, and poet. His chief literary works were the *Anticlaudianus, sive de officio viri boni et perfecti* and the *De planctu naturae*, both moral and allegorical poems intended to portray the weaknesses of human nature and the means to avoid them.

Vincent de Beauvais, a Dominican monk (born about 1184–94, died about 1264), an omnivorous student and devourer of books, *librorum helluo*, is one of the most important names in the history of erudition. He tried to supply the digested learning which the scholarly world, taken up with dialectic disputes, was already disinclined to read in the original texts. And with Dante he was the great vulgariser of the thought of Saint Thomas Aquinas. He composed, probably with the help of assistants, a vast collection of all that was worthy of notice or of imitation

in the world, known as the *Speculum majus* to distinguish it from a smaller one already written. It was subdivided into several parts: the *Speculum naturale*, a survey of the creation, from God and the angels to man and the animals, together with a description of the earth and the sciences as well as man — his soul and body, his sins and virtues; the *Speculum doctrinale*, a survey of philosophy and the sciences, theoretical and practical, including the doctrines of literature (grammar and logic), morals, mechanic arts, physical arts, mathematics, and theology; the *Speculum historiale*, a survey of history from the creation to the times of Innocent IV. A fourth division, the *Speculum morale*, proves to be only an abridgment of the *Summa* of Saint Thomas and must therefore be something tacked on by a plagiarist of Saint Thomas. The *Speculum* of Vincent de Beauvais was for its day as complete a survey of all knowledge as any modern encyclopedia. And from it the scholarly world drew nearly all its material.

Thus a large number of Latin works, of which certain mentioned above stand out, serve to give us the content of thought in the Middle Ages. It was not all religious thought, inasmuch as moral principles were also set forth. Most of the material was also known in a popular form in the vulgar tongue and adapted to the needs of the common people, who did not know Latin. And the spirit which pervades all these works, no matter in which language, is one of didacticism, the lesson being usually taught by allegory or symbol.

We need not be at all surprised at the vast wealth of the literature of edification, in view of the pre-eminence of the Church and of the clergy, the naïf spirit of the population, the wide influence of the religious lecturer or preacher, and the practical as well as the theoretical side of Christianity with which all were so thoroughly permeated. In church, cloister, and public square the preacher, whether regular or secular, swayed the multitude in faith and in action by preaching righteousness or participation in the Crusades. The addresses were often

carefully considered works, in the twelfth century ornate and even pompous, in the thirteenth becoming more familiar. There were great men in those days, and the age of Bossuet, Fléchier, and Massillon should not boast too highly its superiority over the two centuries which produced among their clergy or monks, Cluniacs, Benedictines, Carthusians, Cistercians, Franciscans, or Dominicans, such important preachers as: in the twelfth century, Marbode, bishop of Rennes, Hildebert, Maurice de Sully, Foulque de Neuilly, Saint Bernard; in the thirteenth century, Jacques de Vitry, Guillaume d'Auvergne, Robert de Sorbon, Hélinand de Froidmont.

It is a much discussed question what language was used by the preachers. Some think that it was Latin only, others that they spoke to the ordinary audiences in French and to scholars in the learned tongue. The question is complicated by the queer form in which some of the sermons have come down to us of one language interspersed with constant fragments of the other; indeed, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries we get to astonishing macaronics like those of Menot and Maillard. The common-sense view seems to be that the learned preachers used Latin as much as possible, and always when addressing learned gatherings, that to the people they spoke the vulgar tongue, but that the influence of their reading and favorite studies constantly inclined them to fragments of Latin interspersed in the French. Even though this was not always understood, it would be accepted as part of the religion, being in the language of religion. When it came to writing out a sermon or giving it permanent form for preservation, Latin would be used as the language of scholarship. Some of the preachers were sincere and direct, but the spirit of all didactic literature was to use allegory and symbolism to lend attractiveness to the instruction. To us this seems to produce complexity more than simplicity. The starting-point lies in the mediæval view already referred to that the world is but an allegory or symbol of a higher one. Hence the tendency to express all as a symbol (God and religion

are as ubiquitous behind everything in the world as the solar myth at one time as the explanation of mythology) or to illustrate one thing by another ("Quando quid dicitur et aliud significatur allegoria est"). Nor does allegory stop with the end of the Middle Ages, since we have plenty of it in the seventeenth century in the epic and literary devices like the *carte de Tendre* of Mlle de Scudéry. But in those days everything was permeated with it and everything was interpreted in the four ways: historical, allegorical, tropological, anagogical. Jerusalem is in the historical sense a city of Palestine, in the allegorical sense the Church militant, tropologically it is the Christian soul, anagogically it is the heavenly city, the new Jerusalem.

Hence it comes that religious and profane literature are both so largely permeated with allegory. In religious literature, either in Latin or in French, the form assumed is that of the symbolic explanation by means of *summa* or sermon, or more particularly, in the thirteenth century and after, by *exempla*, like those of Jacques de Vitry, illustrations to the text in the form of short parables or fables containing a moral applicable to the topic at issue and drawn from history, legend, lives of the saints, or even contemporary events. There are also the *Contes moralisés* of Nicole Bozon at the beginning of the fourteenth century. The symbol or moral was constantly based on the remotest likeness or mere verbal similarity, as when the crow was named as the token of delay because he cries *cras, cras* (tomorrow). The Middle Ages were the period of the magnified pun.

In profane literature, which was written more in French, the tendencies, as might be expected, were very much toward a popularisation of life and manners. Ancient literature, including Ovid, the least Godlike of authors, was moralised. Moreover, in consequence of the unscientific attitude of an age ready to accept anything not contrary to faith and morals, in addition to the growing interest in the Orient and the wonderful stories told by returning travellers and Crusaders, there grew up a

kind of legendary natural history which by no means necessarily corresponded with the facts. The best instances of this are the Bestiaries, dealing with beasts, and the Lapidaries or treatises on stones.

The Bestiaries go back to the *Physiologus*, a Latin form of an anonymous work in Greek written at Alexandria in the second century, which in a half-scientific, half-literary way treats of animals, herbs, and stones, each representing one of the "types," God, the Devil, the Church, man. Its success paved the way for both scientific and theological treatises with mystic and moral interpretations, particularly after the writings of Isidore of Seville, at the end of the sixth century, on the same subjects. The *Bestiaire* of Philippe de Thaon, a Norman writing in England at the beginning of the twelfth century and dedicating his poem to the queen of Henry I, is the oldest French work on the subject. But there are several others: two in verse by Guillaume le Clerc and Gervaise, and one in prose by Pierre le Picard, all belonging to the beginning of the thirteenth century. The prose *Bestiaire d'amour* of Richard de Fournival, of the same period, is a work with amorous instead of moral interpretations and is an excellent example of the preciosity of thought and *bel esprit* of the time.

The Lapidaries, bearing the spirit of early Christian mysticism applied to stones, are more directly connected with a Latin poem in hexameters by Marbode, bishop of Rennes (d. 1123), called *De gemmis*. This was considered an authentic scientific work and had the greatest vogue, but its early classical material became complicated by the Oriental legends attributing to stones magic properties, often preserved until now in amulets and superstitions, and the Christian symbolism drawn from the Old Testament and the Apocalypse.

The learned and didactic works were not confined to technical writings: many others had the widest favor. Even foreigners like Brunetto Latini, the master of Dante, wrote the popular *Livres du Trésor* in French. And there were all kinds of *Sommes*,

of *Bibles* (moral poems), of *Chastiements*, *Batailles*, *Débats* or edifying discussions, and books of manners or civility.

But the whole spirit of allegorical and didactic literature in the Middle Ages is summed up in the *Roman de la Rose*.

The *Roman de la Rose* consists of two parts of unequal length. The first, of over four thousand lines, was written in the first third of the thirteenth century by Guillaume de Lorris; the second, of about eighteen thousand lines, had as author Jean de Meun, who wrote half a century later. The work of Guillaume de Lorris is purely an allegorical love poem in which the lover goes in quest of his lady represented by a rose in a garden. His progress is aided or repulsed by sundry characters who are the personifications in allegorical form of attributes of courting or of the worshipped lady. In spite of the characteristic mediæval redundancy of treatment, the love poem of Guillaume de Lorris contains many an attractive passage.

Guillaume de Lorris died without finishing his work, and Jean de Meun's continuation was of a totally different character. In his hands it became a poem of satire of the ideas of his time and a polemical criticism of important topics then under discussion, with violent satire of the clergy and of women.

The influence of the *Roman de la Rose* was probably the greatest single force brought to bear upon the writers of the last two centuries of the Middle Ages, who quoted it, imitated it, revised it, and moralised it. To Marot, who edited it, it was a pattern; even the members of the revolutionary Pléiade were not able to escape its sway. For those who today investigate the history of Humanism and the growth of Classicism out of that movement, the *Roman de la Rose* is interesting, both because of its own pre-Renaissance Humanism and because it shows certain traits which are characteristic of French literature at all times.

The *Roman de la Rose* is, then, the work of two lovers of antiquity, though actual knowledge of antiquity on the part of Guillaume de Lorris was rather small. Ovid and Macrobius

are the only ancient authors study of whom has left traces in the first part of the poem. In the second part, based so far as the framework is concerned on Boethius and the *De planctu naturae* of Alain de Lille, the knowledge of antiquity becomes infinitely greater. The diffuse dissertations of the second part take us through such a varied list as Homer, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Sallust, Virgil, Horace, Livy, Ovid, Lucan, Suetonius, and Juvenal, whether the author himself had actually read them, or whether, as in the case of Greek writers, he got his material at second or third hand.

At any rate, Jean de Meun was one of the first men in imaginative literature to have an appreciating knowledge of antiquity, though the full application of the term must be reserved for a man like Jean de Monstereul. To a direct knowledge of the Latin authors Jean de Meun added the elements of a new philosophy in which, for the first time, we find a reaction against the ecclesiastical forces hitherto oppressing intellectual and moral life. The philosophy of Jean de Meun, proclaiming the identity and sovereignty of Nature[1] and of Reason forms one of the first examples of the literature of rationalism, the importance of which is so great in France.

To this new element in literature introduced by Jean de Meun are to be added certain features common to the two authors. In the first place, the work is an anatomy or psychology of love, however artificial and false; hence both an example, on a much more elaborate scale, of what is found throughout the *poésie courtoise* of the Middle Ages and a prototype of the psychological analysis of character of which French writers are fond, in the fifteenth century as well as in the nineteenth, and of which the master writer of Classicism, Racine, is the most striking instance.

Again, the *Roman de la Rose* is of such importance in the history of allegory and responsible for so much of the perversion

[1] Dame Nature and her priest Génius, who represents the generative forces.

of taste during the last two centuries of the Middle Ages as to make people almost forget that it is not itself the origin of allegory, but merely a stage in the history of a tendency to personify qualities, which extends from Homer to a Justice Shallow of Shakspere, a Sir Fopling Flutter of English literature, or even a Miss Flora McFlimsey of American verse. The *Roman de la Rose* is the "courtly and romantic counterpart of such a philosophical or religious allegory as the *Anticlaudianus*."

CHAPTER X

THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES

THE two long centuries from 1300 to 1500 were not a "*nuit gothique*," as people have said. Literary activity was as great as ever, but it was misdirected. Endeavors toward a French revival were more than once made, indeed the fourteenth century contains the so-called pre-Renaissance which had little permanent effect. The age is, on the whole, an unoriginal and transitional one in which literature has fallen into the ruts of Scholastic form. Composition consists largely of a rehandling of the old poems and a translation of them from verse into prose. The drama alone, as we have seen, is fresh and vigorous. Otherwise the chief literary production, of the fourteenth century at least, was theological. And of these writings, the numerous ones dealing with the exposition or interpretation of the creed naturally contributed to the vague metaphysics which underlies the literature of the two centuries. Then, too, the artificial splendor of the regal court and of the mock chivalry in spite of national disasters inclined people to the superficial part of literary expression, form rather than matter. The display of the Valois monarchs was great. Jean appeared like a king from the *chansons de geste*, surrounded by a retinue of minor kings who spent much of their time in Paris, those of Bohemia, Majorca, and Navarre. The knights of his court attempt to be *courtois*, and over a substratum of natural coarseness, as in the days of the *société polie* of the seventeenth century, they take a veneer of lumbering grace drawn from Flemish and Italian sources as well as from their national inheritance, which soon finds vent in luxuriant metres and complicated rhymes. This is the

spirit of Froissart. The Italian influences, however great they became, were felt fairly late, and Boccaccio was more copied than Petrarch. All through the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries Flemish and other northern influences were almost as great as those of Italy; hence the realism of French art.

The poet who did more than anybody else to promote the cult of form in the fourteenth century was Guillaume de Machault, who was born near the beginning of the century and died in 1377. Though a mere name to most people today, he was in his own age one of the great poets of France. He was in favor with princes and was for many years secretary of the king of Bohemia, killed at Crécy. He was directly imitated by Chaucer among others whose *Boke of the Duchesse* takes hints from his *Dit de la Fontaine amoureuse*, and he gave to English literature the heroic couplet. Indirectly the esteem in which he was held is shown by the position given him by King René of Anjou in his *Hospital d'amour* immediately below Ovid and above Petrarch and Boccaccio. But the most striking evidence is found in the effect of his writings upon poetry in general. Guillaume de Machault was a musician, and music was an art much cultivated in the fourteenth century. By devoting particular attention to the union of verse and music and the composition of songs he became largely responsible for the vogue of the complicated metres in which poets began to delight, metres which became daily more involved until they culminated in the verbal atrocities of the *rhétoriqueurs* who carry into belles-lettres the *procédés* of the Schoolmen. He himself, for instance, took chief pride in the *lai* which was, if anything, more complicated than the other metres. But the form which won chief favor was the *ballade*, as marked a feature of early poetry as the sonnet was later, and used chiefly to express the woes of a suffering heart.

Most of the voluminous writings of Guillaume de Machault, even if they were all printed, would be of little value today. The *Prise d'Alexandrie* is a dull rhymed chronicle; other poems,

such as the *Confort d'ami*, are mere transcriptions from Ovid or from authors admired at the time. He is at times capable of a graceful composition like the *Dit de la Marguerite* (cf. Chaucer's *Floure and the Leafe*); that he is not always high-flown he shows by the realism of the *Dit du Cheval* and his descriptions of the plague. But the *Livre du Voir-dit* is certainly the most interesting.

This long work in prose and verse, which may have been composed about 1363–4, is a sort of "journal amoureux du quatorzième siècle" and may recall, says its editor, such a love as that of Bettina and Goethe. The book relates the amorous intercourse of the already one-eyed and gouty poet with a young girl named Péronnelle d'Armentières who, before ever seeing him, fell in love with his verses and music. The genuineness of the events related has been questioned, but it is fully reasonable to think the work based on fact. It has then the personal quality which we find in autobiographies and confessions, and is valuable because of the many sidelights it throws on the life and customs of the fourteenth century. And the whole is interspersed with characteristic *lais*, *ballades*, *chansons balladées*, *rondels*, *complaintes*, etc.

The metrical tendencies of Guillaume de Machault were carried on by his friend and follower Eustache Deschamps, who was born about 1345 and died toward 1405–7. This author is, in fact, the composer of the first of the numerous Arts of Poetry which follow in a constant succession during the next hundred and fifty years and are distinguished from the later ones of the Renaissance and after by the attention devoted to verse forms as opposed to the consideration of subject-matter. In fact, like all the works devoted to the *seconde rhétorique* (the first being prose), Deschamps's *Art de dictier et de fere chançons, balades, virelais, et rondeaulx* is an elaborate discussion of metrical forms based upon the conception of the necessary connection between music and verse. The importance of such a key to poetry for later writers may be readily imagined, and we need

not be charged with exaggeration in making Deschamps largely responsible for the metrical monstrosities of the following generations.

In other respects Eustache Deschamps is very different from Machault. Though he has the same delight in sporting with versification, yet his general attitude is that of a poetical free-lance. He writes a satire of thirteen thousand verses, *le Miroir de mariage*, to make fun of women and is ready to jeer and jibe at all the other fools of the world, courtiers, clergy, financiers, and many besides. He does not ask for much himself: he praises chiefly a quiet life and asks to be left undisturbed. He is not much versed in literature and takes the *Policraticus* of John of Salisbury and the *Œconomics* of Xenophon for men. His chief characteristic, in fact, is a lack of taste and a complete inability to refrain from writing. An anthology of his writings would contain many charming bits; the published edition is a mass of confusion.

In the intellectual world there was in the fourteenth century an effort toward intellectual freedom. Charles V, *le sage*, was an enlightened patron of art and letters. He was no warrior, like so many of the kings of the time, but a cold and serious student, "né vieux" as Michelet says, of feeble health, who died comparatively early of a strange unknown malady, perhaps the result of poison. Even Petrarch, who hated France and knew but little French himself, thought highly of King Charles, and Jean de Monstereul said of him that "cunctando restituit rem si non dixero ampliavit." He erected many important buildings, constructed bridges, increased the Louvre, protected men of letters, and was himself the owner of what was for the time a magnificent library. Some of his kinsmen, too, were patrons of letters, for the Valois dynasty was always inclined to protect literature. He read much himself, preferring serious works to poetry, and caused various translations to be made into French. So he had Raoul de Presles translate Saint Augustine, and Oresme translate Aristotle, and his appreciation of southern

writers is shown by the fact that Jean Daudin translated for him Petrarch's *De remediis utriusque fortunae.*

Thus Charles V was the Mæcenas of a little group of scholars among whom the most important was Nicolas Oresme. This writer and the slightly older Bersuire were without doubt influenced to some extent by Petrarch and paved the way for Jean de Monstereul who has been called the first of the modern Humanists in France. Unfortunately, for some time he was destined to be the last.

Pierre Bersuire, whose name is found with many spellings, had lived in Avignon where he knew Petrarch. He acquired a fondness for antiquity, probably from the Italian, and when he came to Paris as secretary to King John he wrote at his instigation a translation of the known portions of Livy. The admiration of Petrarch for Livy is well known.

Next in time and greater in point of attainment was Nicolas Oresme, who may be called the first French man of science in the modern sense and another bond of connection with the Petrarchian influences, inasmuch as he was sent to Avignon in 1363. He was a favorite of Charles V who gave him many honors, and to the king Oresme never feared to speak his mind. Thus his treatise on money is a fearless exhortation to the king against debasing the currency, as was so frequently done in the Middle Ages, and the whole work contains the soundest views on financial matters. Oresme did not hesitate, either, to speak his mind against the astrologers who tried to hold the sovereign in the clutches of their superstition. Typical also of his ability not only to learn, but to assimilate and make of practical use the learning of the ancients, is the account to which he turned his own translations into French of Aristotle. For in his attacks against the astrologers he draws arguments from Aristotle, and in Aristotle too he found reasons to induce the king to allow the principle of election in the choice of chancellors. Finally, Oresme is to be named among those who most contributed to the preparation of the language for the Renaissance

movement by the additions which he, like Bersuire, made to the vocabulary.

These two writers, Bersuire and Oresme, represent the first stage in the unconscious effort toward a Renaissance, corresponding in the history of the Italian movements to a revival of learning: they are translators and one of them is a man of science. With the name of Jean de Monstereul in the early fifteenth century we come upon a real Humanist.

Jean de Monstereul (1354–1418) was secretary of Charles VI, canon of Rouen, and provost of Lille. He travelled widely in Germany, England, Scotland, and in Italy where he came into contact with the Italian Humanists. He was killed during the broils between the Armagnacs and the Bourguignons.

He wrote some works in French and much in Latin, including many letters. He was full of the ancients, at least the Latin writers, whom he read and appreciated. His favorite was Cicero, but he was very fond too of Virgil, Ovid, and Terence. Among the moderns he praises highly Petrarch, though he does feel patriotic indignation because Petrarch asserts that there are no orators or poets outside of Italy. He esteems highly, too, his "teachers" Pierre Manhac and Gonthier Col as well as his friend Nicolas de Clamanges. And it was his perhaps unconscious affinity with the new feeling of rationalistic Humanism expressed in the pagan writings of his Italian friends which involved him in a most interesting literary dispute with Christine de Pisan and Gerson about the *Roman de la Rose*.

In language Jean de Monstereul aims at care and finish. It is amusing to note his agony when he discovers that he has sent off a letter containing the comparative *proximior* instead of *propior*, though he does not escape certain other inelegancies, such as a fondness for *guerra* instead of *bellum*. Above all he is fond of quoting his beloved authors and incorporating their language into his own.

Jean de Monstereul is, then, one of the first Frenchmen to discern the true meaning of the Italian revival and to represent

the type in his own country. Unlike the Humanists of the earlier ages he not only loved the ancients, but entered into their spirit; he not only quoted them, but made his allusions apposite and brought their teaching into relation with his own times. But with his death there was a new delay.

Yet the period was by no means one of complete somnolence, as many have implied. We may, indeed, be surprised with Gaston Paris that such romantic events as the saving of France by a shepherd-girl or the epic-like expedition of Charles VIII to Naples should not have inspired new *chansons de geste*. We may fret at the gross realism and *bourgeois* spirit which came over life, literature, and art in the reign of Louis XI. Yet a closer investigation shows a steady infiltration of new elements or at least a preparation for such new qualities. The realism even, inartistic as it is, is the expression of the love of life, still oppressed by the thoughts of death, but awaiting the joyous awakening which the Renaissance is to bring. Science also, though it clings to the old syllogism, is ready for a new age.

And so, as we look over the names of the writers of the fifteenth century, we find many a hint of the coming days. Christine de Pisan is to the highest extent significant of Classical tendencies by the trend of her studies and her taste for style. Or we may say, too, that Alain Chartier, so admired by his contemporaries and by the *rhétoriqueurs*, prefigures the appreciation of style by his choice as a model of Seneca, one of the deities of the Classical school. Martin Le Franc in his *Champion des Dames* is a partisan and advocate of women. Again, we may try to show that Charles d'Orléans was not only the last of the *trouvères*, but the first modern poet as well, for in him we see the remnants of the Middle Ages coupled with hints of Italian perfection of style and the lyric personality of the Renaissance. Finally, we may perhaps justify those who call François Villon, because of his lyric personality, the first poet of modern times and the precursor of the Renaissance.

Christine de Pisan is one of the least read authors in French

literature. Scoffed at as a dull compiler of an unoriginal age, she gets a mere passing mention in most histories. As a matter of fact, few authors met with greater praise in their day, few have had greater influence on their age, few are more distinguished by breadth of mind and diversity of interests.

She was not a French woman, nor was she a native of Pisa: her family may have come from the little town of Pezzano in northern Italy, but she was born in Venice about 1363, the daughter of Thomas of Bologna — *Boulogne la grasce*, not only a centre of learning, but a place where the claims of women to knowledge were not scorned and where the beautiful Novella Andrea lectured to the students from behind a curtain, lest her charms should distract them from their work. Such traditions of her father's home may have influenced Christine's later life, though she came to France at the age of five, when her father was made astrologer to Charles V. But his predictions went wrong, his science was attacked by sceptics like Oresme. So when Christine was left a widow at twenty-five, penniless through law suits and with three young children, she determined to make her living by her pen. Then, too, the decay of learning troubled her. It did not take her long to evolve a literary theory. In studying the *Roman de la Rose* she explains that, just as the Romans in their triumphs gave praise only to what contributed to the common good, so will she study the present work. Her purpose then is didactic and moral, and she seeks not only to magnify the glory of science, but to show that it is morally and intellectually beneficial. Hence her *Enseignements moraux*, though at times they fall into the Chesterfieldian strain,

> Tiens toy à table honnestement
> Et t'abilles de vestement
> En tel atour qu'on ne s'en moque,
> Car on cognoist l'œuf à la coque,

continue the tradition of moralising which we can trace back to the Roman Stoics and bring down through the *sententiae* of

the sixteenth century tragedians and the quatrains of Pibrac to the practical moralising of the seventeenth century and the development of a *bonum* which is *utile*. When she studies history it is also from the moral rather than the chronological point of view, and with due attention to the *ordonnance*. Her life of Charles V is built on a regular plan: the first book proves his *courage* or heart, the second his *chevalerie*, and the third his *sagesse* or *sapience*. Each point is proved by a definite plan of narrative, argument, and example, with material drawn from his biography to prove his good heart, from Vegetius to prove that he fulfilled the requirements of military valor, and from Aristotle to show his wisdom.

Another striking example of Christine's tastes and literary inclinations is to be found in her *Chemin de long estude*. This is no prose chronicle, but a poem on the advancement of learning. The work, which is clearly influenced by Dante ("Vagliami il lungo studio e il grande amore"), describes a long journey taken by Christine under the guidance of the Cumæan Sibyl, as the latter led Æneas or as Virgil led Dante. They visit the spring of wisdom below Parnassus and then travel along the *chemin de long estude* to Constantinople, the Holy Land, Cathay, Arabia, India, Ethiopia, Armenia, the Pillars of Hercules, the Earthly Paradise. Though the Sibyl's geography is mixed she instructs as she goes. With the help of Imagination they scale the ladder of Speculation and pass to the fifth heaven or Firmament. There they behold Raison holding court and receiving a petition from the Earth directed against Richesse. There follow the pleadings before Raison of the four estates, Sagesse, Noblesse, Chevalerie, and Richesse. Each blames the others and the perfect man is sought. As the somewhat vague question at issue cannot be definitely settled, it is agreed to refer the matter to the king of France. At this point Christine awakes, and lo! it was all a dream.

These two works are typical of Christine de Pisan, the student and populariser of learning. But to accuse her of being a

professional blue-stocking is to misinterpret the character of an intelligent woman full of quick sympathies, and implies the neglect of a large part of her poetical work. Another and possibly still more striking proof of her living interests is found in the part taken by her in the controversy over the *Roman de la Rose*. Here we have no collection of erudite extracts, but a spirited defence of women against their slanderers and an attack on Jean de Meun as one of the chief offenders. Jean de Monstereul and Christine are, curiously enough since both were scholars, on different sides: he was impressed by the rationalism of Jean de Meun, Christine stands up for the dignity of her sex, not only against Jean de Monstereul, but against his hot-tempered and uncourteous friend Gonthier Col. With the help of Gerson Christine puts up a good fight and blames Jean de Meun for the over-free speech and deceitful arguments of Raison, the sophistry of *la vieille*, the irreligion of Génius and his attacks on women, in which she is one of the first to detect the naturalism which was to become the paganism of the Renaissance.

A somewhat different Christine is to be found in her lyrical writings. These are good, bad, and indifferent, some of them graceful ("Seulete suis et seulete vueil estre"), some of them verbose and long drawn out, as in the *Livre du duc des vrais amans*. About many of them there is an atmosphere of melancholy, sometimes personal, sometimes assumed; others give pretty pictures of *déduit* and *soulas*, in contrast with the actual woes and wars of the age. Her knowledge of nature is limited, and her idea of spring is confined to the May-day *motif* found in almost all the poets of the Middle Ages. But she is worth reading.

Alain Chartier (circa 1390–circa 1430), though less interesting to us, was even more famous in his day, and the ancestors of Classicism in the sixteenth century also looked back to him with admiration. In the Duchesne edition of 1617 is the list, so often drawn upon by later writers, of the praises awarded to Chartier by his contemporaries and successors. Here we find

the extract from Bouchet which tells of Margaret of Scotland pausing to kiss the sleeping poet and saying, in reply to the comments on his ugly looks: "Je n'ay pas baisé l'homme, mais la précieuse bouche de laquelle sont yssus et sortis tant de bons mots et vertueuses paroles." Here is quoted the passage from Etienne Pasquier praising him as an "autheur non de petite marque" on account of the "gravité des sentences," and calling him "père de l'éloquence française" and "Sénèque français." French Seneca he remained though few have read him since the sixteenth century, and in this epithet as well as the praise of his "sentences" we find the key of his importance. For in Seneca we have a model ever dear to the Classicist, one whose influence contributes to a stately, rather bombastic rhetoric, to be declaimed rather than read, where the author seems to be always acting. Therefore we may certainly attribute to Chartier much of the impetus toward Senecan rhetoric afterward incorporated in the national literature.

But Chartier need not be looked upon as a mere imitator. He has the customary respect for the then accepted masters of antiquity whom he advises one to study, Seneca, Homer, Virgil, Livy, Orosius, Trogus Pompeius, Justin, Valerius Maximus, Statius, and Lucan. But in his works in prose and verse he rises to originality and manifests a feeling of patriotism which touches a responsive chord in the hearts of modern French students of that period. In many respects Alain Chartier is the adept in allegory with whom we are becoming so familiar. In the *Livre de l'Espérance* the characters of Mélancolie, Entendement, Défiance, Indignation, Désespérance, etc. appear in a dream and do their best to bury the author's eloquence about the woes of France. In his light poems, the *Lay de Plaisance*, the *Débat du Réveille-Matin*, the *Lay de la belle Dame sans mercy*, we meet with nothing new. The success of the widely imitated *Belle Dame* is but the occasion for the contemporary poets to burst into a new spasm of sentimental insipidity. Even in the *Curial* he is perhaps cribbing outright the Latin work of an

obscure Italian Humanist, Ambrosius de Miliis. On the other hand, in the *Quadrilogue invectif*, so called because it is a discussion between four people, the invective carries the writer above his allegorical and abstract trappings, and the sincerity of his emotions makes him burst into really eloquent passages.

To the historian of literary tendencies Alain Chartier is, therefore, at once a representative of a passing school and a force destined to exercise its influence upon the succeeding one. Quite as much cannot be said of the two remaining great authors, Charles d'Orléans and François Villon.

Charles d'Orléans (1391–1465), the father of Louis XII, was the aristocratic poet who dabbled in verse as an amusement. For twenty-five years he was a captive in England after Agincourt and, on his return to France, lived chiefly at Blois, grouping about him a band of sympathetic spirits. His writings had practically no influence on his times, inasmuch as they remained unpublished until the eighteenth century, but they are the work of a dilettante of genius, expressing incessantly the feeling of "nonchaloir" or epicurean detachment. They are almost entirely mediæval poems, yet they are the most graceful expression of the Middle Ages, and this "troubadour du nord" shows what can be done with the *ballade* and rondeau in verses such as the famous poem on spring:

> Le temps a laissié son manteau
> De vent, de froidure et de pluye.

François de Montcorbier or des Loges, called François Villon or François de Villon, was born in 1431; the date of his death is unknown, but it was probably before 1465 or 1470. He is one of the great poets of French literature, but his influence on later generations was smaller than it might otherwise have been, because, though his spirit is modern, he is very closely wedded to the mediæval forms of expression. Very different from the *rhétoriqueurs*, he is a personal poet and has been called the first one of the Renaissance.

Though a master of arts of the university, François Villon lived to regret his neglected opportunities:

> Hé Dieu! se j'eusse estudié,
> Au temps de ma jeunesse folle,
> Et à bonnes meurs dedié,
> J'eusse maison et couche molle!
> Mais quoy? je fuyoie l'escolle
> Comme fait le mauvais enfant . . .
> En escripvant ceste parole
> A peu que le cueur ne me fent.

He became a vagabond and ne'er-do-well, associating with drunkards, murderers, and low women, getting himself involved in murders and thefts, and being condemned to death, though afterward pardoned.

Villon's writings, externally considered, continued the general tendencies of the *Roman de la Rose* and of the lyric school which sprang largely from Machault and Deschamps. He constantly uses the *ballade* as form of expression. On the other hand, his subject-matter is original and reflects, as no other poet of his day did, his own thoughts and those of his time: the lust of life overshadowed, as it was not during the Renaissance, by the thought of death and decay.

The chief works of Villon were the *Petit Testament* and the *Grand Testament* in which he repeated a device favorite to some mediæval poets of bequeathing imaginary legacies to friends and foes. The stanzas making up these poems are interspersed with *ballades* or an occasional rondeau. Of these the *Ballade des dames du temps jadis* with its refrain "Mais où sont les neiges d'antan?" ranks among the most famous and most translated poems of French literature. There is historical sentiment in these verses; there is true religious feeling in the poem for his mother to Notre Dame, which has been compared with Heine's *Wallfahrt nach Kevlaar;* there is satire in the *Contreditz de Franc-Gontier*, an answer to verses of Philippe de Vitry of the fourteenth century on the pleasures of rustic life; there is

filthy passion in the *Ballade de la grosse Margot* and the melancholy of age portrayed in the *Regrets de la belle heaulmière*, on the courtesan regretting the passing of her beauty. Still another famous poem of Villon, though not in the same collections, is the *Ballade des pendus*, supposed to have been written when Villon expected execution:

La pluye nous a buez et lavez,
Et le soleil desechez et noircis;
Pies, corbeaulx, nous ont les yeux cavez,
Et arraché la barbe et les sourcilz.
Jamais, nul temps, nous ne sommes assis;
Puis çà, puis là, comme le vent varie,
A son plaisir sans cesser nous charie,
Plus becquetez d'oiseaulx que dez à couldre.
Ne soiez donc de nostre confrairie,
Mais priez Dieux que tous nous veuille absouldre!

Several well-known poems formerly attributed to Villon are now denied him. The *Jobelin*, or writings in thieves' slang or jargon, are more likely genuine.

PART II

THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

CHAPTER I

THE RENAISSANCE

THE sixteenth century marks a tremendous change in all the divisions of French intellectual life. In it we see the full advent of the Italian Renaissance and the spirit of intense liberty and reaction against dogmatic tradition for which it paved the way. As a result of this invasion of foreign elements which followed closely on what Michelet calls the "discovery" of Italy, the first half of the century, almost to the death of Francis I, is a period of the greatest turmoil. All kinds of elements are present, confused and interrelated, and so entangled that it is difficult to label any single author. Accordingly, historians are free to classify after their bias and emphasise the author or period which is to them most interesting. Thus, chronologically, we shall find the reign of Francis I impartially called the foreshadowing of the Renaissance or the first age of the complete Renaissance, and we shall begin our list of "new" authors with Lemaire de Belges, or Marot, or some other. Again, if we try to map out the tendencies of the times, we shall be puzzled by the difficulty of drawing a dividing line between them and of assigning one writer to one class. Not only does the same name spring up in widely separated spheres of literary activity, but we are also unable to sever one order of writers from another: Reformers are sometimes Humanists, at other periods they are hostile to them; fellow-Humanists, too, show unexpected enmities, as in the quarrels of the Hellenists and Ciceronians, or worse yet, the jealousy of Erasmus and Budé.

The impression produced, particularly by a glance at the reign of Francis I, is, then, one of turmoil, a restless thirst for

knowledge. The Renaissance, in throwing off the shackles of the Middle Ages, has given full vent to the freedom of the individual who seeks his enjoyment either in physical pleasure or in intellectual liberty. The man of the Renaissance, in Italy as in France, lived for pleasure and sought to surround himself with all that could caress his senses: art, architecture, music, not to speak of the good cheer and *dive bouteille* of Rabelais, and the lust for woman. The Abbey of Thélème is the allegory of the concrete life of the early Renaissance.

On the intellectual side the Renaissance shows this same liberty, the spontaneousness of the ancient Hellenic world. The Reformers alone accepted a new servitude, which they set up by their own volition. And this individualism is obvious everywhere, in politics and the conduct of nations, no less than in the many-sided activity of persons. In the sixteenth century disorder is as noticeable as the order and method of the next century. Here we come upon the versatile men of letters, at once physicians, jurisconsults, poets, and philologists. Others like to relate their own memoirs.

Beginning, then, in the usual way, we shall say that the sixteenth century, in spite of its apparent incoherence and external ebullition, manifests a uniform tendency towards harmony. In other words, when once the French invaders of Italy saw the marvellous works of art and architecture in the South, as well as the polished prose and verse of Italian literature, and when they began to compare this perfection with the spiritless aspect of their own possessions; when they contrasted the union of spirit and matter in Italy with the formlessness (popular literature) and the excess of form (*rhétoriqueurs* and flamboyant Gothic architecture) of their own art, they realised that something was wrong and unconsciously set about remedying the defect, either by the use of new material or by the imposition of a new form upon the old material.

The sixteenth century, then, reacts violently against authority and proclaims its own value, its own rights and prerogatives.

Concretely this reaction takes the form of the addition to the intellectual wealth of the French (such as a knowledge of Latin literature externally considered and without a true appreciation of its spirit) of a treasure found in Italy. This treasure was a better conception of Greek and Latin art and letters remoulded and somewhat modified by a sojourn in Italy.

Thus the tremendous awakening of individualism and the development of personality, — the "coming to self-consciousness," as Burckhardt calls it in the case of the Italians — which had been favored by circumstances in general, like the invention of printing and of gunpowder, the discovery of America and of Italy itself, led the French to attempt a new disposition of life and a judging of its accomplishments by a new standard. It was pre-eminently a rejection of the old standard of authority, — tradition. In thought Scholasticism was to be done away with; in prose literature we must discard the remodellings of the old *chansons de geste;* in poetry, the *ballades* and exhausted metres; in art, the involved Gothic. All these intellectual expressions had been the result of constant accretion, so that upon a slender basis of idea was constructed a large superstructure of form.

The Renaissance took as many of the old ideas as were suitable, and endeavored, after the addition of new material, to get another harmony of idea and form. And because of release from authority, people had a greater liberty in the choice of a standard. Hence the division of movements in the sixteenth century, just as freedom of worship among the Protestants has multiplied sects in opposition to the single unified authority of the Roman Church. Some chose other models than Italy for actual imitation, though the prime factor in the awakening was Italy.

One element soon severs itself from the others, the element of the Reformation, the purest idealism, less modified by Italy and antiquity. In this case the individual, rejecting the seemingly false and corrupt dogmas of a degenerate Church, sought help in the purer atmosphere of early Christian religion. This

was a return to the primitive Church, not a return to nature. To the Reformer nature is corrupt.

On the other hand, another set of men of the Renaissance, under the guidance of Humanism, passed over the primitive Church and its conception of life as a struggle between a spirit and a corrupt body and revelled in the pagan harmony of mind and matter and the goodness of nature which that union implies. Consequently we see in many typical representatives of the French as of the Italian Renaissance, a total abandonment to nature and a following of its inclinations. And this, not with the mental reservation that such a course is wrong, but with the feeling that nature is good.

But a yielding to nature and to its impulses cannot last for ever, else the inevitable result will be demoralisation and decay. Humanity seems to be in need of some ideal, intellectual if not moral, either imposed from without or of its own creation, "si Dieu n'existait pas il faudrait l'inventer." Hence the gradual development, along with the growth of the Renaissance, of rationalism. Rationalism, at first the liberty of reasoning, then transformed into the doctrine of the supremacy of reason, shows itself in the Reformation intertwined with a moral or ethical phase. In the other divisions of life and thought it remains a more purely intellectual conception, whose rights grow and increase until their authority seems no less absolute than that of mediæval times. So that when we reach the reign of Louis XIV and the heyday of Classicism, we are again confronted with absolutism and despotic rules in taste as well as in lawgiving.

To follow out this thought would, however, be anticipating. It remains to ask what was the guidance exercised by the Humanists upon the men of the Renaissance. These men, when they avoided the mistakes of an Italianism, that was not far-sighted enough to look beyond the contemporary Italian Renaissance, were lovers of antiquity. There had been students of the past, as we have seen, in the Middle Ages. But the new Humanists,

of whom we have found a precursor in Jean de Monstereul, are of a different kind. They not only study the external qualities of antiquity, but they understand its spirit, and many of them know the literature of Greece as well as that of Rome. The Humanists, then, who were formerly men with a love for a misunderstood antiquity, now become men with a LOVING KNOWLEDGE OF ANTIQUITY. Increased familarity breeds a desire for a better imitation or assimilation of classical qualities. Hence the growth of Humanism coincides with the growth of taste, the search for artistic perfection, by imitation of the ancients. It involves most of the old classical ideals as understood by the best interpreters of Classicism then in the world, the Humanists of the Italian Renaissance. Among these elements of Humanism which now emerge are the consciousness of the value of the study of man, the desire for glory, the realisation of the continuity of the old world into the new, the appreciation of the idea of beauty. In the first days of the French Renaissance Humanism is in the hands of technical scholars who, unfortunately, are apt to divide into hostile camps: the Hellenists or school of Budé, and the Ciceronians or school of Bembo. As time goes on it extends its sway. For a while, even, it goes hand in hand with the spirit of the Reformation. All the important Reformers passed through the training of Humanism, and nearly all the early Humanists were in favor of a religious reorganisation. Indeed, their aims at first are quite similar: Reformers, as well as Humanists, substitute for authority freedom in inquiry, replace the old beliefs by a simpler and more rational dogma, and seek a broader and more accurate culture, by the study of original texts drawn from a wider range. This Humanism is to be contrasted with the modern literary Cosmopolitanism misnamed "Humanism," which tries to extract the *substantifique mouelle* not only from antiquity but from all races and ages.

In the earlier part of the reign of Francis I we find the two groups of Humanists and Reformers united against the Middle

Ages. It is only when the persecutions begin that the more militant and pugnacious follow Calvin, while those who are fond of a quiet life confine themselves to the study of language or extend their investigations into intellectual domains which do not encroach upon the realm of Faith. When Humanism spreads from technical scholarship into literature, and when the spirit of Humanism at last takes hold of *belles-lettres*, as it does with the Pléiade, then we can at last say that Classicism is penetrating into French literature.

The reign of Louis XII is, in literature at least, part of the Middle Ages. The wars of Charles VIII and of Louis XII have not produced their effect. Anne de Bretagne still delights in the poems of Meschinot; Cretin is high in favor. Lemaire de Belges, who has travelled in Italy, alone shows inklings of the new art.

The reign of Francis I is the dawn of the Renaissance. There is as yet no clear distinction of currents, but Reformation, Humanism and Italianism are mixed up in an almost inextricable confusion. We find, however, clear indications of a parting between the old traditions represented by the Church, the university and the law, and the new ideas typified by such men as Budé.

The services of Francis I in favor of learning must not be esteemed too highly. Francis was personally brave, but not so brave morally. His intentions may often have been good, but he was not judicious in furthering them. Then, too, he was surrounded by many influences as unfavorable to learning as that of Budé was good. The opposition reached his very court, where the Cardinal de Tournon was jealous of any novelty and opposed all liberal moves. Beyond the court, the doctors of the Sorbonne no less than the jurists, such as Lizet who worked for the burning of Dolet, were reactionaries. So much so that the Sorbonne in 1535, in its opposition to what it considered heresy, extorted from the king letters-patent forbidding under penalty of death the printing of books in France and closing all

booksellers' shops. Such a measure, though rescinded, shows how little Francis was the *père des lettres* and how much the new learning had to contend against.

Francis, too, was partly Italian by education. His mother's favorites had been Octovien de Saint-Gelais, a Petrarchist, and the works of Italians, including Boccaccio. When king he imitated the literary patronage of the Italian princes. Thus it was the task of the Humanists to guide literature and learning between the Reformation and Italianism and to encourage the fondness for antiquity.

But in the *entourage* of Francis distinctions are not clearly made and specialisation has not yet begun. And to a less degree this is a characteristic of the whole century. As Sainte-Beuve says: "On ne songeait pas à l'apanage du talent. On faisait des vers comme on fait de la médecine. Tout lettré faisait des vers. Ainsi les rimes de l'imprimeur Dolet, de l'avocat Sibilet, de Peletier du Mans, de Pasquier." Similarly in the circles of Francis and Marguerite were to be found Budé, Lefèvre d'Etaples, and Marot.

Throughout the reign of Francis I literature properly speaking is scarcely humanistic. The school of Marot, it is true, runs into that of the Pléiade, if it should not be said rather to fade away before it, but Marot and Mellin de Saint-Gelais are not Humanists. The most prominent features, then, in the reign of Francis I of the growth of that Renaissance tendency which is to become Classicism, are Italianism and Humanism striving for admission into French. The Italian influence is the starting-point of almost every movement. Literature and life are steeped, too, in an environment of art and culture brought northward from the peninsula. To this had contributed not only political ties, embassies and the kinship of princes, but the closer ties resulting from the sojourn of Italians in France and of Frenchmen in Italy. The mediæval fortress was transforming itself into the *château* of Touraine, a northern counterpart of the Italian *palazzo* or country villa, while artists thronged to the court of

France, Leonardo da Vinci, Andrea del Sarto, Primaticcio, Benvenuto Cellini. Nor should we forget to mention among the literary men Luigi Alamanni, who lived in France during a large part of the reign of Francis I.

CHAPTER II

THE GROWTH OF HUMANISM

IN the last years of the Middle Ages education had become totally unscientific. It seems even ludicrous to mention the two terms education and science together. Aristotle was the universal authority, and the Aristotelian method was the basis of all argumentation. Not only was he quoted in support of the most evident propositions, as that you cannot give to another what you do not possess, but everything was discussed by the syllogism.

Such a method of study and of instruction could lead only to exaggerated disputatiousness which often veiled but little that was truly reasonable ("le raisonnement bannit la raison"). One is consequently not surprised to hear of violence as a method of persuasion. There were "Sorbonic" disputations lasting all day and degenerating into scrimmages. Teachers were proud of having their lecture-rooms resound with clamor, for this was considered to indicate intellectual vigor. A picture of university life in the early sixteenth century shows us, too, a dirty and sordid existence in unhealthy buildings ruled by rigid masters. We remember Rabelais's scorn for the "collège de pouillerie qu'on nomme Montagu," and Erasmus is no less vehement against the same college, where he was made ill by the rotten eggs, and the dirty bed in which he had to sleep.

Progress had to come, and it came from without. The first modifications were, indeed, hinted at by Frenchmen who, though of Latin culture and mediæval tradition, nevertheless rose above their fellows. Then several foreigners, not always teachers themselves, brought the new learning from Italy. A third generation shows scholars of not only French race but also

French feeling, such men as Henri Etienne, Etienne Pasquier, and Jacques Amyot.

As early as the days of Jean de Monstereul we have seen traces of literary perception. Other scholars, Pierre d'Ailly (1350–1420) and Gerson (1363–1429), were intelligently intimate with the classics. Nicolas de Clamanges (d. 1437) boasts of renewing the cultivation of letters and of eloquence. In the late fifteenth century the advance is still more clear, though culture is entirely Latin. Guillaume Fichet directed his efforts towards an emancipation of rhetoric from Scholasticism and helped the establishment of printing in Paris. His tendencies were seconded by his friend and admirer Robert Gaguin (1433–1501), who prided himself on being "fichetista." He was familiar with the spirit of Latin literature, wrote in both French and Latin, and composed neat epistles. He, too, is not undeserving of the name of Humanist.

Such influences could not help causing a response in general instruction. By 1489 the faculty of arts decided that "poets" or teachers of the Humanities could lecture for an hour in the afternoon, and the Italian Fausto Andrelini is found at the university as professor of rhetoric and poetry. Three other Italians, Filippo Beroaldo, Cornelio Vitelli, and Girolamo Balbi, are there about the same time. Andrelini (1460–1518), of Forli, who had been a pupil of Pomponius Laetus, became so much a Frenchman that he seemed to lose all love for his native land. His works included Latin poems of love, friendship, piety, and morality and *Epistolae proverbiales et morales*. He was a friend of great people like Erasmus, and himself known as "poeta regineus et laureatus." He lectured daily, "multiplex et quotidiana interpretatio," particularly on Ovid and Virgil. Though he belongs to the Latin side of culture, yet he must be considered a formative influence of the early French Renaissance and its Humanism. But we are now at the moment when Latin Humanism is to be entirely renewed by the advent of Hellenism.

For the sake of historical completeness we must go back to 1456, when an Italian with a knowledge of Greek, a pupil of Chrysoloras, named Gregorio Tiphernas of Città di Castello, undertook to teach the language in Paris. In 1476 a native Greek, named George Hermonymus of Sparta, settled in Paris, where he tried to make his living by teaching and by copying manuscripts. He gave instruction to men of no less renown than Reuchlin, Erasmus, and Budé, though the last two cannot find epithets sufficiently opprobrious to heap upon his ignorance and greed. Reuchlin and Lefèvre d'Etaples are much more friendly in their appreciations. Almost contemporary with Hermonymus was another Greek, Andronicus Callistus, a partisan of the philosophy of Gemistus Pletho, who enjoyed some reputation in Paris, though we have no very palpable evidences of his influence.

The old order changes. Instead of foreigners of indifferent ability we come upon a Greek of inspiring influence, John or Janus Lascaris (1445–1535). He was of imperial origin and attached himself to Charles VIII, coming to France with him after the Italian expedition. He was not a pedagogue but a man of multifarious occupations. He organised the library of Blois, helped Budé in his studies, and became ambassador of Louis XII to Venice. Being now back in Italy he helped in the plans of Leo X for the establishment of the Greek college in Rome. This experience stood him in good stead when he was soon after ambassador from the pope to Francis I, who sought his advice in the plans for organising the proposed college of learning in Paris.

But the great teacher is still to come. Girolamo Aleandro (1480–1542) had been proofreader for Aldus Manutius at Venice, where he knew Erasmus. He came to Paris in 1508 and opened courses in the following year, brushing aside another scholar, the meritorious but modest François Tissard. He taught Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, and after a journey to Orléans he again lectured in Paris, where he created a furore, to audiences

of a couple of thousand persons. Though a foreigner, he even became rector of the University, and it was only because of illness that he gave up teaching He afterwards rose to be papal nuncio and cardinal. Because of his great success and the high standing of his friends and pupils, Aleandro is of much importance in the history of French Humanism. Unfortunately, after he ceased his instruction, teaching fell back somewhat into the old ruts, until the efforts of Budé and of Duchâtel succeeded in creating the rivalry of the royal lectureships.

We now reach the great names of Humanism, Erasmus and Budé. Erasmus (1466–1536), though not a Frenchman, cannot be omitted in an account of French Humanism. He was the greatest man of the Renaissance, and by his many acquaintances, his varied interests, his travels, he touches upon all sides of intellectual life. He is the universal wit, often compared to Voltaire, an active though a lazy teacher, advocating many reforms, famous as the author of satirical writings and works of scholarship.

To the average reader the name of Erasmus possibly most naturally suggests his connection with the Reformation. To us he is no less important for his position in Humanism; in fact, his character was rather that of the student than of the militant Reformer. And in his relations to both movements he manifests the same tendencies and is an excellent example of the growing spirit of Rationalism which coincides with the rise of Classicism. With the Humanists he preaches intellectual freedom, and steadily refuses, whether from indolence or cowardice, to compromise himself with the Reformers, leaving to Luther the task of hatching the egg he had laid. To Erasmus the intellect should be left free to reason at its pleasure; hence possibly the real cause of his aversion to the intolerant "dogmatism of denial" of Luther. Erasmus thinks, moreover, that the revelations of religion have not added everything to life that makes it worth living. He implies, particularly in the *Adages*, that modern man enlightened as he is by the dispensations of

Providence, may still learn much from the men of old who were guided only by the light of reason.

The rivalry of Erasmus and Luther is thus readily comprehensible. His thinly veiled dislike of Budé, since they were both leaders in the same movement, must be ascribed to meaner motives and a more petty spirit. His connection with France was close, though he is at times uncomplimentary enough to France and the French ("merdas istas Gallicas"), and he was urged by both Francis I and Budé to return there and help in the establishment of the royal lectureships, but he never consented. Nevertheless, through his writings and his intercourse with distinguished Frenchmen the influence of Erasmus was felt by nearly all scholars in France.

His French rival, Guillaume Budé (1468–1540), was a true scholar and Humanist. He was the greatest Hellenist of his day in France, and stood high in favor with Francis I. He wrote, besides translations from Greek into Latin and many letters, studies upon philology and erudition and works in favor of the revival of learning. His most important books were the *De Asse* on Roman coinage, and the *Commentarii linguae graecae* marking the advent of accurate scholarship.

Budé was not such a universal man as Erasmus, but he was more thorough. He built more solidly and with more concrete results. To the modern student the importance of Budé lies in the fact that his writings give evidence of the rise of that rationalistic spirit typical of the sixteenth-century Humanist. He was, too, more than anybody else, influential in bringing about the foundation of the royal lectureships, thus making possible the reform of the university and the overthrow of Scholasticism.

Some of the most useful material for the understanding of Budé's position in the rise of Classicism is to be found, not in his longest productions, but in the minor writings, particularly his *De studio litterarum recte et commode instituendo*. This work shows in a marked degree how greatly Budé contributed in the

field of scholarship to the development of freedom of reasoning or the rationalistic spirit which encouraged the growth of French Classicism. His effort to revive the rationalism of Greek literature not only helped French scholarship, but made the spirit of Greek literature more accessible to men of letters.

The gist of this work is that Greek literature contains a useful doctrine suitable for the refinement of life. It has true philosophy, which is the expression of human reason based upon the knowledge of man and of his relations with God. Rational philosophy, then, is the result of experience, developed by study under the guidance of genius, which is needed to direct, and of which we have the noblest manifestation in ancient Greece. Philosophy under this guidance will find expression in literature, eloquence and the other divisions of intellectual life. Our efforts must, therefore, be to increase our knowledge of ancient Greece, its language, its literature, its eloquence, that is to say by the study of philology taken in the broader meaning, not with the restricted sense now given to the term.

Budé, it may thus be seen, was one of the first in France to look beyond ancient Rome into Greece, and there to separate from the mere language those additional qualities which make Hellenism of permanent value to a modern world — a literature of pre-eminent beauty, which could be made of practical use as a model to pattern a new literature free from the curse of authority and at liberty to develop in a rational or reasonable manner.

Such theories needed opportunities for application. Budé sought the ear of the well-disposed but fickle Francis I. It took his hardest efforts combined with those of Pierre Duchâtel, later the king's reader, and of the Cardinal du Bellay to establish and maintain a foundation destined to encourage the new learning. It was not until 1529 that the efforts of Budé and of his fellow-Humanists, seconded by Marguerite de Navarre, resulted in the foundation of the royal lectureships. The foundation dates from March, 1530. It was not a college, but merely an establishment of professors or lecturers, without

even a permanent home. The title of *collège royal* is not used until 1610, when a building was erected. It is now the *Collège de France.*

The Reformers met with the greatest hostility from the whole university, and from the Sorbonne in particular, which could not view with equanimity the independent study of ancient texts. But the new learning had gained too strong a headway. Henceforth there were lecturers supported by vigorous men without the university and a few advanced principals of colleges.

Such was the course of Humanism in France during the first half of the sixteenth century, so far as scholarship is concerned. Along with the organiser Lascaris and the pedagogue Aleandro, we find the general moving influence of Erasmus and the more definite efforts of Budé to advance the study of Greek and the general cause of Rationalism and of free inquiry.

But even he, in one way, belongs to the preliminary stage. He does not yet fully appreciate the value of French and the necessity, for the propagation of the humanistic spirit, of using the national language. He wrote, indeed, in French the work published later under the name of the *Institution du prince*, for Francis I, who did not know Latin, but his own opinion is that the ancient languages, Greek above all, Latin next, are alone sufficient to make man eloquent. The Humanists would have liked to make Latin not only the literary language, but also the spoken tongue of Europe. But they had one great obstacle to contend with. They wished to do away with the bad Latin of the Middle Ages and substitute for it a pure idiom. But the reason why the discarded Latin was un-Ciceronian was because it was a living language, keeping pace with ideas and customs. By going back to a classical language the scholars found themselves out of contact with modern times. Perhaps this obstacle may have hastened the desired end, and it is when the Humanists at last use French that, with the Pléiade, they take possession of national life.

Even before the time of Budé, a fellow-Humanist, Claude de

Seyssel, in 1509 had advocated the use of French for the vulgarisation of the sciences, though his work was not published until 1559. Indeed, throughout the first fifty years of the sixteenth century, a long list can be made of writings showing the gradual encroaching of the French language. And in 1539 King Francis, probably merely for political motives and to ensure the spread of the royal authority, did the Humanists a service which perhaps both he and they failed to appreciate, by enjoining in the decree of Villers-Cotterets the use of French in all legal documents. By this means the national language was forced into one of the most reactionary corporations of the kingdom.

It must not be assumed that Budé was the only type of Humanist. Hellenism, presupposing a knowledge of Latin literature, is the fullest bloom of Humanism. But French Classicism is rather Latin than Greek, and, even in the sixteenth century, those thoroughly familiar with Greek were in the minority. Even in the best of times translations from the Greek were often through the Latin. Etienne Dolet (1508–1546), hanged and burned on a charge of heresy, was convicted for an alleged mistranslation of the *Axiochus*, then attributed to Plato, which he had got, not from the Greek but through the Latin.

There were, then, Ciceronians as well as Hellenists, the school of Bembo as well as the school of Budé. The Ciceronians usually ignored Greek. Their hero was Cicero, outside of whose works there was no salvation. These were the people whom Erasmus mocked when he told of the exclamation of the youth, "Decem iam annos aetatem trivi in Cicerone," to which Echo answered ὄνε. The leaders of Ciceronianism were the solemn Longolius (Longueil) who took Ciceronianism so seriously that he was never seen to smile, Villanovanus (Villeneuve), Sadeleto, the bishop of Carpentras, Dolet, and the astounding humbug[1]

[1] This term refers of course to his personal boasting; his *influence* was great.

Julius Cæsar Scaliger (1484–1558), who also saddled French Classicism with useless technicalities.

And the Humanists were not a happy family. They imitated the vituperations of their Italian predecessors and were jealous among themselves. The Ciceronians hated the Hellenists, and there was hostility in the same camp, for Budé and Erasmus the Hellenists were not any too fond of each other, while Scaliger hated Dolet even more than he did Erasmus, who was to him "omnium ordinum labes, omnium studiorum macula, omnium aetatum venenum, mendaciorum parens, conviciorum sator, furoris alumnus," as well as "scelestus, mentiens, insaniens, barbarus, blaterans."

CHAPTER III

THE TRANSITION IN POETRY. THE RHÉTORIQUEURS. LEMAIRE. MAROT

AT the end of the fifteenth century and in the early years of the sixteenth, literature was entirely under the sway of mediæval ideas. The self-centred intellectual life, lacking in critical taste or discernment, had fed upon itself and had become as œdematous and "exsufflicate" as the flamboyant architecture which was its manifestation in another sphere. Of learning there was much, too much, a Latin learning, turgid and pedantic, which had permeated all conscious literature, as opposed to the popular productions, like the mysteries and the farces, meant for the people at large.[1] Thus just before the seething ferment and activity of the Renaissance, when literature becomes itself again, throwing off its shackles and admitting once more reason and thought, the spirit of individualism and lyric expression, we find the tendencies all towards involution and complication. It is the age of the *grands rhétoriqueurs*, last effete descendants of a long line extending from Machault and Chartier. They represent, in its most complicated form, the dying literature of the Middle Ages, and their work has been compared to the recent literary schools, the

[1] The struggles of the king and commoners against the nobles had in many cases resulted in an extremely philistine or *bourgeois* spirit. But this element, together with the theatre, belongs to the side of the *esprit gaulois* and not to what will be the germ of the *esprit classique*. The sermons of Menot and of Maillard are also *bourgeois* in spirit, though learned in form, if delivered in Latin or even in macaronics. The story called the *Petit Jehan de Saintré* also has much of the same plebeian attitude.

décadents, who made up for want of meaning by plentiful metrical innovations and copious symbolism, corresponding to allegory.

A study of the transition in literature leads one, then, first to the *verbocination latiale* of a number of partly foreign, partly French writers, many of them grouped about the court of Burgundy. These poetasters delighted in wild artifices of language and versification, yet they are far from being without importance, because, though they represent a dying tradition, they had influence on the new poets. Marot was distinctly guided by their style and versification, and Ronsard is in many respects only a successor of the *rhétoriqueurs*.

The earliest name is that of Georges Chastellain (1404 or 5–1475), chronicler or historiographer (*indiciaire*) of the court of Burgundy, who wrote voluminously in involved prose and did much in verse. His work was continued by Jehan Molinet (1435–1507). Among his productions were a prose rendering of the *Roman de la Rose* ("moralisé cler et net"), a treatise on poetry long attributed to Henry de Croy, and a continuation of Chastellain's chronicles. Two other names, Meschinot and Cretin, stand above the remaining writers, but far below Lemaire de Belges, and with them we pass for a time away from Burgundy.

Jehan Meschinot (1420–1491), a Breton, wrote much occasional verse dealing with moral topics, religion and love, and political satires against the king of France. He is best known for his *Lunettes des Princes*, partly political and partly allegorical, which marvellous spectacles, given by Reason to the poet, consist of Prudence and Justice for eyes, Force for mounting and Temperance for bridge.

Guillaume Cretin (d. 1525), is a connecting link between France and Burgundy and one of the great influences upon his younger contemporaries, who laud him to the skies. To Marot he is *souverain poète françois*. Posterity has, indeed, rather sided with Rabelais, who sneers at him as Raminagrobis and introduces into his writings, to make fun of it, a sonnet by Cretin. But

posterity has been, in some respects, unjust. Looking through his writings we are surprised to see how many pages are innocuous and free from excesses of metre. It is only later that Cretin completely loses his head and falls into the divagations which have impressed themselves on people's minds. Meschinot had set a good pace when he composed a poem to be read in thirty-two different ways. But in many of his poems Cretin does not go beyond harmless exuberance of rich rhymes. They become disagreeable, however, when they take the form of *rime équivoque* ("le bon Cretin au vers équivoqué") or make unpleasant overflows. Then we find monstrosities: *coqueluchant* rhyming with *quoy qu'il eût chant*, or *rimes équivoques* and *couronnées* like the following:

> Frère et amy, si sonnettes sont nettes
> Et environ Alençon alle en son,
> Sonne vers moy chansonnettes honnestes,
> Et de ta fleur rendz pour leçon le son,
> Ayme Cretin et boy son à boysson,
> Il ne m'en chault comme j'aille en mangeaille,
> Si mieulx que pis y a plaine ma jaille.

In Lemaire de Belges we come upon a writer of a totally different kind. Sainte-Beuve rediscovering sixteenth-century poetry thought a few lines sufficient for him. Today he deserves careful study as one of the important members of the early French Renaissance. Jehan Lemaire de Belges was not a Frenchman. He was born in 1473 in the Low Countries, at Belges or Bavay (now French territory). He was a nephew of Molinet, and perhaps his godson, if names go for anything. He was in the service of several princes, in whose memory he composed some of his important poems, having been first urged to write by Cretin, the friend of his uncle Molinet, though it is not improbable that he in turn influenced Cretin. Lemaire's most important service was that of Margaret of Austria, on whose estates he lived for some years at Pont d'Ain, enjoying the friendship of literary and artistic circles in Lyons. He also

travelled a great deal in Italy. The end of his life, strange to say, is wrapped in darkness. He probably died about 1525, though according to some he lived on in madness until 1548.

Lemaire is an important link between the Renaissance and the preceding ages. He shares certain characteristics of the previous epoch. On the other hand, he shows in much of his poetry what it had not, a lyric personality. The times were certainly propitious. The Northern world was ready for the new ideals from the South. Then, too, Lemaire lived near Lyons, the "second œil de France," frequented by merchants, students on their way to and from Italy, printers, painters and men of letters. He himself visited the land of Petrarch and of Boccaccio. But he had qualities of his own which made him unconsciously cut loose from his predecessors. He is more direct, concise and sincere. He tries to make the metre subordinate. The most interesting works of Lemaire are the *Epître de l'amant vert*, the *Temple d'honneur et de vertus*, the *Concorde des deux langues*, the *Couronne margaritique* and the *Illustrations des Gaules et Singularités de Troie.*

The *Epître de l'amant vert* is an elegy in the first person, a lament by Margaret's pet green parrot, which had died during her absence from him. The *Temple d'honneur et de vertus* shows Lemaire with his face turned towards the past. It is a work in prose and verse to the memory of Pierre de Bourbon, and in both prose and verse it exhibits eccentricities of style. Take, for instance, a rhetorical outburst about,

> -ce petit traicté consolatoire: affin que vous veïssiez voz cris dedans escriptz couleur de douleur plains de tous plaintz. Et que voz soulas qui sont las et voz rys qui sont peritz prissent quelque sourse (de ressource): Affin que l'honneur de Bourbon bon resplendist en triumphant, triumphast en florissant et flourist en accroissant par la diuturnité de tous siècles advenir.

But passages like the following justify Lemaire's position as a graceful poet:

Gentes bergerettes,
Parlant d'amourettes
Dessous les couldrettes,
Jeunes et tendrettes
Cueuillent fleur jolie,
Framboises, meurettes,
Pommes et poirettes,
Rondes et durettes,
Flourons et flourettes
Sans mélancolie.

The *Concorde des deux langaiges* expresses the desire, by a description of symbolical temples of Venus and Minerva, to bring about union and harmony between the French and Italian languages as well as between the nations. How thoroughly convinced Lemaire was of the possibilities of French, fond as he was of Italian, is to be seen in the opening chapter of the *Illustrations des Gaules*, in which he speaks of "ce langage François que les Italiens par leur mesprisance accoustumée appellent Barbare (mais non est)." Thus Lemaire, like Claude de Seyssel, is a precursor of Du Bellay.

The *Illustrations des Gaules et Singularités de Troie* was, in Lemaire's opinion, to be his *magnum opus*, and here he gave full vent to his faculties as a historian. It was to be a noble chronicle, a history to satisfy the genealogical aspirations of the nations and princes honored by it, a monument of learning, a treasure-house of instruction to the young duke Charles, later the emperor Charles V. The author begins with Noah or Janus, "le bon père Noé —" whose descent leads one through Ham, surnamed Zoroaster or Pan or Sylvanus or Saturn; Osiris called Jupiter and his wife called Ceres, and Hercules, king of Gaul, Italy, and Spain. This early history of religions brings one to the foundation of Troy at the end of the first book. The second is devoted to the Trojan legend, and the third relates the various migrations of the Trojan nobility and the common origins of the houses of France, Burgundy and Austria. Here the work stops, though Lemaire's plan had originally been far more extensive.

If we can pass over all the strange features of this work, anachronisms, the projection of current ideas into the past, we realise many new elements in literature. This is particularly evident in the episode of Paris and Œnone, where he lets his imagination play with the language and writes a tale in poetic, almost rhythmic prose. But he is important for matter as well as form. Even the mocker Rabelais found material in him; Marot is constantly indebted to him; Ronsard owes to him the inspiration of what was to be his own *magnum opus*, the *Franciade;* Pasquier calls him several times one of the great authors of the age.

Two other poets of the old school, though best known because of greater sons, were not without importance, Octovien de Saint-Gelais (1468–1502) and Jean Marot (d. 1526). The former was a follower of the Italians and a friend of Louise de Savoie, consequently an influence in the education of Francis I. His translation of the *Heroides* of Ovid had great vogue. The latter was a *rhétoriqueur*, full, as he says himself, of "squalid and barbarous squabrosity." His most important poems are narratives or chronicles of expeditions, to which must be added a number of casual poems which had a distinct influence on Clément Marot.

Jean Marot's son Clément is placed in various categories by the different writers who have dealt with him. If there had been no Pléiade to mark a separation from the past he would be put among the important precursors of a new literary spirit, and there are even now critics who much exaggerate his Humanism. As it is, it is convenient to call him, like Lemaire de Belges, a transitional writer. The fickleness of the poet's character has also enabled Catholics and Protestants alike to claim him for their own. Marot was chameleon-like and took the color of what he fed upon. By birth and training he was a disciple of the *rhétoriqueurs*. His character was, however, modified not only by the prevalent Italianism, but by many new influences visible particularly after 1525, but which do not justify us in

calling him a true Humanist. His tendencies towards religious reformation are clear, through the influence of Marguerite de Navarre and of Renée de France, but here, again, he never dared to have very strong convictions. We may say of Marot, as compared with his most illustrious contemporary Marguerite, that where she partakes of the serious qualities which, in an incoherent state, are characteristic of the times of Francis I, Marot emphasises the light features typical of French style at its best. In this, as La Bruyère pointed out, he is often more modern than the later poets of the Pléiade.

The writings of Marot are closely interwoven with his life. He was born between 1495 and 1497 at Cahors in Quercy, of a Norman father and a Southern mother, thus combining the traits of both races. Up to the age of ten, at least, this French poet knew no French, only the dialect of his native Quercy. After coming to Paris he wrote, in 1515, his first important original poem, the *Temple de Cupidon*, influenced by the *Roman de la Rose* and the *rhétoriqueurs*, Lemaire's *Temple de Vénus*, Molinet's *Temple de Mars*, Martin le Franc's *Champion des Dames*, and perhaps the *Temple de Diane* by a Jean Leblond. It is a graceful poem in easy swinging metre, not too complexly allegorical, though many of the characters of the *Roman de la Rose* make their reappearance. It is the quest of True Love. The youth seeks her at first unavailingly, until at last he comes to the temple of Cupid, where Zephyr sighs and Tityrus sings, and Pan and his shepherds tend their flocks to the sound of pipes and rippling streams. The sanctuary, to which Bel-Accueil admits sincere lovers, is described in gay ballad metre. On entering they behold an altar which draws the lover to it, surmounted by a fragrant cedar canopy. The saints are Beau-Parler, Bien-Celer and many others, the bells are tabors and dulcimers, the alms ladies' sighs and kisses, and for holy works one reads Ovid, Chartier, Petrarch and the Romance of the Rose. Within this shrine the lover still has to hunt for some time, until at last he finds love in the heart or choir (*chœur*)

of the temple in the company of a prince and lady whom we are to take for Francis and Queen Claude.

The *Epître du Dépourvu* and the *Epître au Roi* are two other poems characteristic of Marot's early stage. The former is an entreaty to enter the service of Marguerite de Navarre. The epistle to the king is one of the worst examples of Marot's "Cretinism." It begins:

> En m'esbatant je fais rondeaulx en rithme,
> Et en rithmant bien souvent je m'enrime;
> Brief, c'est pitié d'entre nous rithmailleurs,
> Car vous trouvez assez de rithme ailleurs,
> Et quand vous plaist mieulx que moy rithmassez,
> Des biens avez et de la rithme assez:
> Mais moy, à tout ma rithme et ma rithmaille,
> Je ne soustiens (dont je suis marry) maille.

In 1524 and 1525 Marot was in Italy with Francis, where he was taken prisoner at Pavia. After this he becomes more original and less an imitator of "Cretin, Cretin qui tant sçavoit." Soon after his return from Italy he got into trouble. The Sorbonne was becoming active with the encouragement of Louise de Savoie. So Marot, who had somehow offended a mysterious Luna of whom he writes and had doubtless gained some tinge of the Reform in Marguerite's environment, was arrested at the instigation of a Dr. Bouchart and confined in the prison of the Châtelet, though he was soon transferred to more comfortable quarters and then released. During his imprisonment he worked at his edition of the *Roman de la Rose* and composed three of his best known poems: an epistle to Bouchart in which he protests that he is no heretic, the famous fable of the Lion and the Rat from which La Fontaine drew, and his *Enfer*. This last, suggested by such opposite poles of influence as Dante and Lemaire's *Amant vert*, relates some of his experiences in prison.

Release did not get Marot out of trouble. At last he judged it

advisable to go out of reach of the Sorbonne and withdrew to the court of Marguerite at Nérac, and then to that of Renée at Ferrara. To this period are due the welcome to France of Queen Leonora and the justly famous *Complainte, en forme d'églogue* on the death of Louise de Savoie (1531), which Marot drew from Sannazar and was in turn imitated by Spenser in his *Shepherd's Calendar*.

At the court of Ferrara Marot continued his writing. He composed his *blasons* on the *Beau tétin* and the *Laid tétin*, an imitation of the Italian *capitoli*, which became the source of an abundant literature of *blasons* in France, and wrote several of his epistles du *Coq-à-l'âne*, incoherent letters on current events, a continuation of the mediæval *fatrasies*. Some writers think that to Marot was due the introduction of the spirit of the Reformation at the court of Ferrara.

He returned to France by way of Venice, and at Lyons in 1536 he publicly abjured all his sinful ways of thought. It was soon after this that he composed one of his graceful poems, the *Eglogue au Roy sous les noms de Pan et Robin*, full of autobiographical allusions and nature touches.

Towards the end of Marot's life came a long quarrel with Sagon, a former friend whom he had offended. The dispute, which was full of the most violent personal abuse, was participated in by all the important literary men of the day, and Sagon got decidedly the worst of it. Marot also dabbled again in religious matters and, with the help of the scholar Vatable, began to translate the Psalms. At first they were well received by all, and hummed to popular tunes. But the jealousy of the Sorbonne being again aroused, Marot ran away to Geneva. There he got into trouble with Calvin and went to Piedmont, where he died in obscurity and disgrace in 1544.

Marot was almost a great poet. He was at first enthralled by the *rhétoriqueurs*, and his beginnings are much below Lemaire's average. After 1525 his poetry is transformed and becomes

more personal, though he was always under the lure of the Italians like Tebaldeo, Olympo and Serafino dall' Aquila. But his thoughts rarely dwelt on matters of the deepest import. He was essentially a light French poet, ready to indulge his *muse maroline*, which disports itself through his many epistles and filthy rondeaux and epigrams. Those last are influenced by the Italian *strambotti* of writers such as Serafino or the epigram-sonnets of Tebaldeo. At the same time he had inklings of higher things. We must not, like Professor Henry Morley, make of him a martyr of the Reformation dying for his faith among the persecuted Waldensians. Nor, on the other hand, need we fall into the exaggerations of Lenglet Dufresnoy and his obscene tales of Marot as the lover of Diane de Poitiers and of Marguerite de Navarre. We need only say that Marot was like most men in a day when passions were not concealed; and, as with most poets, his emotions were stronger than his will. His associations led him among the Reformers, and his *Balladin* shows what his spirit was at the very end of his life, yet his convictions did not weigh heavily upon him and he was perfectly willing to abjure his Protestantism. Above all he was an epicurean. The best proof that he was not a bard sublime was the weakness of his influence.

He had, it is true, many followers, Charles Fontaine, Victor Brodeau, Jean de la Borderie, but only one deserves serious mention, Mellin de Saint-Gelais (1487–1558).

Saint-Gelais was certainly not a great poet, but essentially a *poète courtisan* and, what he has been called, "l'Homère des vers d'album." Marot's own name for him was "créature gentille." But, though unimportant in himself, he is significant, in a history of French literature, because he is partly responsible for an element adopted, to its detriment, by the Pléiade, Petrarchism. For this element, in the essence, Maurice Scève is largely responsible. But the concrete form it took in French poetry is partly due to Mellin de Saint-Gelais, who is one of the claimants for the introduction into France of the sonnet,

a claim rightly belonging to Marot. But Saint-Gelais was responsible for much of its vogue. He was an arch-Italianist, spent many years in Italy and translated for the first time into French the *Sophonisba* of Trissino, a play of the highest importance in the history of the drama.

CHAPTER IV

THE PLATONISTS

THE history of the Renaissance in France is closely interwoven with that of Platonism,[1] which is, under various forms, one of the dominating influences of the age. Literary Platonism, and notably the expression of Platonic love, is a prominent feature in the study of nearly all the poets of the sixteenth century, whether precursors of the Pléiade, members of the group itself, or its successors. Philosophical Platonism, a modified form of the doctrine of Plato, was preached by all who were opposed to the Aristotelian Scholasticism. It represents the spirit of liberalism, of rationalism, the Renaissance spirit in general, which has its greatest exponent in Ramus and expresses the tendency which becomes in time the philosophy of Classicism. In the Pléiade, Platonism is a form of *belles-lettres* and merges into Petrarchism.

The doctrine of Plato now, as in the Middle Ages, contributed much to thought, for of Petrarchism it is not yet time to speak. That specific form grows up, through Italian influences, during the first half of the sixteenth century, but does not acquire its full force until towards the end of that time. And the Platonism of Marguerite de Navarre has its own quality. It is not the theological adoration of Dante, it is not the love of chivalry, but a mixture of love, literature and religion, with a strong philosophical tendency, sometimes metaphysical, sometimes in an elementary way psychological. This came partly from the

[1] In this chapter the term "Platonism" is used in a special sense, at variance with the pure Hellenic doctrine. It might even be called "pseudo-Platonism."

revival of philosophical Platonism which had taken place in Italy during the fifteenth century. In the case of Marguerite, in whom the religious element was strong, it took the form of eager mystical yearning.

Leaving aside for the present the rationalistic Platonism of Ramus, and confining ourselves to literary and social Platonism, we, therefore, find in it two elements. On the æsthetic side, older than Petrarch but very noticeable in him, it has those features with which we are now familiar, worship of some fair woman who represents the ideal. This form of Platonism is in opposition to the old spirit of the *fabliaux* and farces, and is more akin to the tendencies of the romances of chivalry. It has the same sensuous, sometimes erotic, element, and, as a result of the passage through the Italian Renaissance, it emphasises the element of concrete beauty. At no period has the physical and intellectual sway of woman been greater than in the sixteenth century, when Louise de Savoie and Marguerite de Navarre made treaties of European importance, when Marguerite and Renée guided the Reformers, when Francis I thought no man deserving of respect who did not follow a mistress, when Henry II found an Egeria in Diane de Poitiers. It was the age when there was a recrudescence of the vogue of the prose romances of chivalry, and when the Spanish *Amadis* was translated and permeated all court life.

The other element of literary Platonism is a metaphysical one derived mainly from the Italian neo-Platonists and the Florentine Academy. Its early history takes us back to Gemistus Pletho, who in the fifteenth century brought to Italy a grand but confused scheme of poetic neo-Platonism, to Cardinal Bessarion the great patron of letters, to Marsilio Ficino the guiding philosopher of the Florentine Academy and author of the *Theologia Platonica*, to the German mystic, Cardinal Nicholas Cusanus. By the majority of French people this doctrine was never taken very seriously. Only in the case of mystics, like Marguerite, did it seem to afford help in solving the vague

problems which troubled her, and for which she could find no other release. It was largely through Ficino that Marguerite knew Plato at all, and she knew him chiefly through the translation of the commentary on the *Symposium* made at her request by Simon du Bois (Silvius, de la Haye) in 1546. On the other hand, the rediscoverer of the real Aristotle, Lefèvre d'Etaples, at the instigation of Briçonnet, bishop of Meaux, published in 1514 an edition of the works of the Platonist Cusanus. Thus the religious circle of Meaux, with which Marguerite was at one time closely connected, was itself much interested in Cusanus. We need not be surprised to find her borrowing from Ficino the celebrated definition of God, used by many writers, as a circle whose centre is everywhere and whose circumference is nowhere, while from Cusanus came the reiterated formula "Je suis Celui qui suis" (Exodus iii. 14), and the antithesis of *Tout* and *Rien*.

Marguerite de Navarre (1492–1549) was a woman of high intellectual ambitions and inclined to favor all that would promote the advancement of learning and of religion, though it will not do to make of her an out-and-out Reformer. Her high position enabled her to accomplish much, and her own aspirations led her to try to be a poet, — a vocation for which she was never fitted. Probably no writer ever lived whose works contain less poetry. As a rule they are merely metrical formulations of the vague metaphysics above mentioned. Page follows page of rhymed moralising in which there is not a single new or striking thought, in which the only value is for the study of sources and formative influences. After reading pages of mysticism like the *Oraison de l'âme fidèle* or the *Triomphe de l'agneau* we feel the truth of Marguerite's own words:

> Mes larmes, mes soupirs, mes criz,
> Dont tant bien je sçay la pratique,
> Sont mon parler et mes escritz,
> Car je n'ay autre rhétorique.

Mysticism is, indeed, the key to Marguerite's writings. In practical life she accomplished much, as her diplomatic achieve-

ments and her attempts to rescue Francis from captivity testify. But her own life was one of an unhappy marriage and disappointed loves for brother and daughter, ending at last in a consumptive's death. This life of tears and sighs, characterised by a sweetness of disposition ("un nenny avec un doux sourire") and a gentle-heartedness which surprised her contemporaries, was not a normal one. Her thoughts are, at times, almost unbalanced in their broodings, and her hallucinations seem, by tradition, to have had their counterpart in morbid actions. The anecdotes are familiar of her eagerly bending over the deathbed of her maid of honor to discover the soul escaping from its prison, and of her making an appointment with a man at the grave of the woman he had loved, dead without his knowledge.

Without attributing too much importance to possibly apocryphal tales, we thus see that one of Marguerite's chief intellectual characteristics was an almost grovelling mysticism and upward yearning towards the Divine:

> Moy donques ver de terre, moins que riens,
> Et chienne morte, ordure de fiens.

In its extreme form, as in the character of the *bergère ravie de l'amour de Dieu* (*Comédie jouée au Mont de Marsan*), this yearning uses the same erotic language, confusing sacred and profane love, which is to be noticed in many of the Italian saints,

> Et je seray sa mignonne,
> Il sera mon grand mignon,

until it fades away into the quietism of the *libertins spirituels*, Quintin and Pocques, whom Marguerite received in her circle, to the disgust of Calvin. For a parallel to Marguerite in French literature we shall have to wait until the days of Madame Guyon. But this attitude was merely spiritual. In private life the mystery-wrapped princess was energetic and practical.

For Marguerite's education had included other elements than those which went to build up her mysticism. It had been

largely Italian and had brought her into contact, not only with the older poets like Dante, but even more the modern writers who had treated the question of courtesy and polite love. The *Heptameron*, for instance, brings us to that portion of Platonism which has not to the same extent fallen under the sway of metaphysics. Theories of courtesy remind one of Castiglione's *Cortegiano*, and the well-known definition of perfect love in the nineteenth tale of the *Heptameron* is characteristic.

The *Heptameron* is the paradox of Marguerite's life. In addition to the *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse*, the *Marguerites de la marguerite des princesses*, and the recently published last works, of which the most important are some allegorical comedies, the *Prisons de la reine de Navarre*, and the *Navire*, she wrote, or probably wrote, a collection of dull stories in the spirit of the *Decameron* of Boccaccio. The work seems immoral today, and Queen Marguerite has been classed as an indecent writer. But this does not follow, if we make allowances for the differences in the times. She lived in a day of much greater frankness than the present. No charges can be brought against her personal character, and even Bonnivet, whom she probably loved in youth, was unable to seduce her, though Louise de Savoie winked at his intrigues.

The *Heptameron* follows the general plan of the *Decameron*. Some travellers, caught by bad weather on their journey, while away the time by telling stories. The characters are perhaps drawn from life: the leader Oisile (Loise) may be Louise de Savoie, Parlamente Marguerite herself, and Hircan her second husband, Henry d'Albret, king of Navarre. Dagoucin represents the Platonic lover, Saffredent and Simontault stand for the ironical *esprit gaulois*. It is Parlamente who gives the definition of love:

"J'appelle parfaicts amans, luy respondit Parlamente, ceulx qui cherchent, en ce qu'ils aiment, quelque perfection, soit beaulté, bonté ou bonne grâce; tousjours tendans à la vertu, et qui ont le cueur si hault et si honneste, qu'ils ne veulent pour mourir, mettre leur

fin aux choses basses que l'honneur et la conscience réprouvent; car l'âme, qui n'est créée que pour retourner à son souverain bien, ne faict, tant qu'elle est dedans le corps, que désirer d'y parvenir. Mais à cause que les sens par lesquels elle en peut avoir nouvelles, sont obscurs et charnels par le péché du premier père, ne luy peuvent monstrer que les choses visibles plus approchantes de la perfection, après quoi l'âme court, cuidans trouver, en une beaulté extérieure, en une grâce visible et aux vertuz morales, la souveraine beaulté, grâce et vertu. Mais quand elle les a cherchez et experimentez et elle n'y trouve point celuy qu'elle ayme, elle passe oultre ainsi que l'enfant qui, selon sa petitesse, ayme les poupines et aultres petites choses les plus belles que son œil peut veoir, et estime richesses d'assembler des petites pierres; mais en croissant, aime les poupines vives, et amasse les biens nécessaires pour la vie humaine. Mais quand il cognoist, par plus grande expérience, que ès choses territoires n'y a perfection ne felicité, désire chercher le facteur et source d'icelle. Toutesfois, si Dieu ne luy ouvre l'œil de foy, seroit en danger de devenir d'un ignorant ung infidèle philosophe. Car foy seulement peut monstrer et faire recevoir le bien, que l'homme charnel et animal ne peut entendre."

About 1544 there appeared at Lyons a work called *Délie, objet de plus haute vertu*, by Maurice Scève. This author, from certain points of view one of the important precursors of the Pléiade, was a leader of the group known as the Lyons School, which at the middle of the century gave literary fame to the city and gathered about Louise Labé, *la belle cordière*, not only members of the old school of Marot but also partisans of the new Pléiade, Ponthus de Thyard and Olivier de Magny. *Délie*, which is supposed to be an anagram of *l'Idée*, was a model not only for the Platonism or Petrarchism of the Pléiade, but for numerous Delias, Ideas and Diellas of English literature. For Scève was a Petrarchist or a follower of Petrarchists like Serafino dall' Aquila as well as a Platonist, and in *Délie* he presents a composite of the two elements, which, in fact, at times almost coincide. Délie stands for some idealised lady whom the poet praises through most of the four hundred and forty-nine dizains

which make up the volume. Whoever she was, she became, under the poet's pen, an intangible and unintelligible being. She took possession of him early ("*Libre vivais en l'avril de mon âge*"), and his admiration for her charms rises from the description of soft graces and the feeling of chaste love until it becomes more and more involved in thought. The poet manages to work himself into such states of incomprehensibility as the following:

> Déliberer à la nécessité,
> Souvent résouldre en périlleuse doute,
> M'ont tout, et tant l'esprit exercité,
> Que bien avant aux hasards je me boute,
> Mais si la preuve en l'occurrente doute.
> Sur le suspend de comment, ou combien,
> Ne doy-je pas en tout prévedir si bien,
> Que je ne soye au besoing esperdu?
> Las, plus grand mal ne peult avoir mon bien,
> Que pour ma faulte estre en un rien perdu?

It is on reading such passages that one agrees with what Etienne Pasquier said in the same century, "que, le lisant, je disois estre très content de ne l'entendre, puisqu'il ne vouloit estre entendu."

So much relates rather to the obscurity of the poem. Its language and vocabulary are at times Greek (*antipéristase*, *hydraule*,[1] *embolismal*), but one is more often reminded of Petrarch and his imitators. The general spirit of the verses shows that the poet has combined Petrarchian adoration with the vague metaphysics of his day. But with all his faults, Scève marks an advance. His lines do not have the flippant flow of the *muse marotine*, and he is striving to express some idea, albeit "caliginous." In his erotic mysticism typical of the Lyons school, his philtered words verging on preciosity, and in the high coloring of the love *motif* carried on through so many stanzas, one is often reminded of Rossetti's *House of Life*. Scève reaches a higher idealism, Rossetti steers clear of incoherence.

Maurice Scève was one of many. His follower, a woman,

[1] "L'humidité, hydraule de mes yeux."

Pernette du Guillet, many have been the real Délie. The "rhymes" of this *gentille et vertueuse dame* appeared in 1545 and outdo in obscurity those of Scève. With more variety of metre she deals with similar subjects, including *Parfaicte amytié*. Antoine Héroët's *Parfaicte amye* is still better known. Stress has often been laid on the writings of Léon Hébreu (Leo Judæus, Juda Abarbanel or Abravanel), a Spanish Jew who wrote in Italian three dialogues on love. They were translated into French by Pontus de Thyard and by Denys Sauvage du Parc of Champagne. They consist of conversations between Philo and his Sophie (*Philosophie*), respectively on the essence, universality and genealogy of love. They are a strange medley of philosophic talk involving definitions of the different kinds of Good, together with discussions of anatomy, astrology, poetry and fables or myths. The third dialogue brings us to final definitions of the rise of Love, how the Love of God for the universe and that of the universe for God came at the birth of the world, how Love is derived from Knowledge and Beauty, and has as object the delectation of the lover in the beauty adored.

Much more attractive in its Platonism is another work, the *Conte du rossignol* of Gilles Corrozet (1547). It tells of a youth named Florent in love with a fair damsel named Yolande, who is, however, too modest to yield to his wishes. She thinks, too, that love, instead of feeding the baser appetites, ought to be an occasion

> D'avoir vertu, qui l'homme déifie,
> Estudiant en la philosophie
> De double nom, morale et naturelle.

Hence she bids him seek wisdom. For three years he studies Aristotle, Cicero, Pliny and Plato, and then returns to Yolande. But she has one more strange request:

> Mais je vous prie autant que je puis faire,
> De me vouloir en un point satisfaire,
> Car femmes sont de sçavoir curieuses;
> Puisqu'ainsi est qu'aux estudes fameuses

Avez esté pour sciences apprendre,
Ne vous soit grief me donner à entendre
Que c'est que fait, quand de couple charnelle
Le rossignol départ de sa femelle,
Et, si cela de vous je puis sçavoir,
Tous vos désirs de moy pourrez avoir.

Florent consults his books in vain, but at last an old crone tells him that the male and female nightingale meet only upon a green branch, after which the male seeks a neighboring dry one, where he trims himself and then bathes in water. Florent bears this information to Yolande, who draws the moral:

Amy, tous ceux qui se joignent à femmes
En charnel acte et par amours infâmes
Sont tout ainsi que rossignols plaisans,
Sur rameau vert qui se vont déduisans
En leur luxure et amour sensuelle,
Puis, quand prend fin la volupté charnelle,
Tombent soudain dessus le rameau sec,
Laissans l'amour et le plaisir avec.
Ce rameau sec pour sa signifiance
Note d'honneur et d'amour l'oubliance,
Où tombent ceux qui, pleins de leurs plaisirs,
Ont accomply tous leurs vilains désirs.

Let Florent remember how the love of Yolande has made him wise and good, and let him not, like the nightingale, fall by a base love from the green to the withered branch.

On hearing these words, Florent stood long as though turned to stone. Then his foolish love passed away, leaving him devoted to a chaste worship of his lady, which she accepted:

Ainsi l'amour lascif et sensuel
En un instant devint spirituel,
Ferme trop plus qu'onques avait esté
Tant que raison vanquit la volupté.[1]

[1] Corrozet did not invent the story, but got it from the Italian writer Caviceo. Cf. F. Gohin's edition of the works of Antoine Héroët, Introd. pp. xxx-xxxi.

CHAPTER V

RABELAIS

FRANÇOIS RABELAIS, the son of a prosperous notary of Chinon in Touraine, was born probably on the country estate of La Devinière, in a house still standing, a few miles from Chinon, between 1483 and 1495, in all likelihood nearer the more recent date. The actual period of his death is also unknown, but it took place between 1552 and 1554. The prosperous abbey of Seuilly was less than a mile from his birthplace in the same parish, and there Rabelais presumably had his first schooling, which tradition reports as having been continued at La Baumette or La Basmette, near Angers. Our first definite knowledge of him is, however, as a Franciscan friar at Fontenay-le-Comte in Lower Poitou, where he and his friend Pierre Lamy, interested in the new learning, chafed at the ignorance of their associates and tried by correspondence to win the friendship of Budé. Rabelais at last succeeded in obtaining permission for a transfer to the neighboring Benedictine abbey of Maillezais. Geoffroy d'Estissac, the bishop of Maillezais, a see now moved to La Rochelle, was a friend of Rabelais, who probably saw much of him here and at Ligugé, near Poitiers. We next hear of Rabelais as a medical student and bachelor at Montpellier a few years later, in 1530. He had meanwhile probably made a student's circuit of some of the chief French universities, and conjecturally had followed law courses at Bourges and Orléans. He had also, without permission, left the Benedictine Order and assumed the garb of a secular priest.

Settling at Lyons, Rabelais practised at the hospital and began his literary production. Leaving the hospital, again without

authority, he went to Rome in the train of Jean du Bellay, the cardinal, in 1534. The brothers Guillaume du Bellay-Langey and Jean du Bellay were both staunch friends and patrons of Rabelais. He made in all three trips to Rome, obtaining during one of them absolution from the pope, Paul III, for his infractions of monastic discipline. He became a regular doctor of medicine as late as 1537, and won some distinction by his anatomical lectures at Montpellier and at Lyons. In 1540 he was at Turin as physician to Du Bellay-Langey. After the latter's death he went for a time to Metz, then outside of France, where he probably was taking refuge in dread of persecution. His third visit to Rome was with Cardinal du Bellay in 1548. Finally, in 1550 Rabelais received the livings of Saint-Martin de Meudon near Paris and Saint-Christophe du Jambet near Le Mans. He resigned both posts a couple of years later, for reasons not perfectly clear, and died soon after.

The most important works of Rabelais, and the only ones of interest to the modern reader, are his romances of giants, *Gargantua* and *Pantagruel*. There are many obscurities concerning the publication of these writings, and even the authenticity of some of them. The following exposition is, perhaps, a conservative treatment of the questions involved:

While in Lyons, Rabelais, who had the itching for authorship, either himself wrote as a pot-boiler, or came across and edited, a highly successful popular chap-book called the *Grandes et inestimables chroniques du grand et énorme géant Gargantua*. Accordingly, at some date not earlier than 1532, he wrote a continuation to the *Chroniques*, developing in a more elaborate narrative the story of Gargantua's son Pantagruel. Afterwards, he rewrote and developed the story of Gargantua in an edition of 1535, or perhaps 1534, which is thus chronologically posterior but logically anterior to the first book of *Pantagruel*, known as the "second book" of Rabelais. In consequence of the success of these writings Rabelais published a *tiers livre* in 1546 and a *quart livre* in 1552. The fifth and last book did not appear in

complete form until a number of years after Rabelais's death, in 1564. The authenticity of this last book is disputed. From a literary standpoint many parts are inferior, but there are as many contrary arguments, based on the contents, and it seems more natural to think that Rabelais left his work almost finished but unrevised.

The writings of Rabelais are to the modern reader among the most difficult in French; therefore, though one of the most famous authors, he is one of those least read. His reputation for indecency also frightens many away. Consequently, the "enigma" of his works has been transferred to the author, and the interpretations or misinterpretations of Rabelais's character and of his writings are most ludicrous. To the average educated reader in the sixteenth century his books were not more obscure than the *Lettres persanes* to the eighteenth century or Anatole France's *Ile des Pingouins* to the modern Frenchman. Indeed, they were sometimes too plain, for Rabelais more than once felt it politic to tone down the directness of his allusions in order to avoid persecution. A similar common-sense interpretation of his personality is the most probable one.

We reject, then, as fantastic the idea prevalent for many generations which made of Rabelais a drunken buffoon, involved in all kinds of escapades and undergoing traditional experiences sometimes borrowed from the adventures of his own heroes. It is no less ridiculous to think of him as a deep philosopher veiling under symbolism and allegory his solution of world mysteries. Rabelais was, indeed, a genius, but only the culmination of the spirit of his time and place, and not a prodigy of a different species. To know Rabelais thoroughly means to know what the early sixteenth century was thinking and talking about, more than the knowledge of any other author of the century implies. Though little studied in detail, he deserves study more than any other author of his day except perhaps Montaigne. Montaigne explains later thought, Rabelais explains that of his time. He was a vigorous, full-blooded rep-

resentative of the well-to-do middle class, coming from a thriving and characteristically French province, then intellectually one of the most representative. He possessed in the highest degree intellect, wit and humor, particularly that *esprit gaulois*, satirical and broad, many would say coarse, which the French acknowledge as characteristic of their popular mind. On this foundation was superimposed all the erudition of an age whose scholarship was vast and totally different from that of today. It was the antithesis of specialisation and aimed at being *de omni re scibili;* and of course, in its technical aspects, it was based on works long since totally discarded. In Rabelais this learning ranged from popular chap-book literature and the successors of the mediæval epics and romances to the contemporary *rhétoriqueurs*, or from the classics of Greece and Rome to the modern Italian writers, in Latin, in macaronics or in the pure vernacular. It included all the technical book-learning of the schools, outgrowth of the mediæval Scholasticism, as well as law and medicine, and above all, the religious problems at that time troubling the minds of everybody. These were all familiar topics to the average educated reader of Rabelais, who would be at most puzzled now and then: a wild juggling with words, or a less familiar reference which, it must be confessed, Rabelais himself often got at second hand from the repertories of more systematic thinkers like Erasmus. With regard to the contents of *Gargantua* and *Pantagruel* we ought at most to say that he began them as humorous works, permeated with good-natured satire of contemporary foibles, but that as time went on, he put into his writings more mature reflection and made the substratum of his story more seriously intellectual.

The narrative and its probable interpretation are approximately this: Rabelais's hero Gargantua was, in name at least, borrowed from popular folk-lore. He was the son of the giant king Grandgousier, who varies in character from a monarch to a country squire. The mighty land over which he ruled was a tiny district about Chinon and La Devinière, and Rabelais

gets much enjoyment in treating insignificant hamlets, meadows and river fords, the names of which are still in use, in the tone of martial and epic narrative. Gargantua's early education proved a failure, because it followed the fossilised methods of the old scholastic routine. It was only after going to Paris, under the escort of a new tutor, Ponocrates, whose theories are the result of the teachings of the Italian Humanists from technical authors like Vittorino da Feltre to writers on good manners like Castiglione, that Gargantua became very different from the usual product of the "Sorbonne-Donkey" (*sorbonagre*) training.

Meanwhile war had broken out between the subjects of King Grandgousier and a neighboring monarch, King Picrochole, who seems to be a portrait of a member of the well-known Sainte-Marthe family, with whom Rabelais's father had a lawsuit. Gargantua returned home, and mighty battles and sieges took place in the quiet district around Seuilly and La Devinière, ending in the victory of Grandgousier's forces. Heroic deeds, particularly in defence of the abbey of Seuilly, were performed by the frisky monk Frère Jean des Entommeures, a mighty eater and drinker and, from a literary point of view, a skit on the heroes of the old *moniages* of mediæval epic, who, like Renouart, did valiant deeds with a mere *tinel*.[1] All the chief combatants were rewarded for their achievements, and to Friar John was granted the foundation of the abbey of Thélème, the antithesis of the old monasteries and convents, and the embodiment of the new social Platonism. Its architecture was the expression of the new Renaissance château, instead of the mediæval fortress; no monk or nun was to be tolerated there, but it was to be the home of well-born lords and ladies together. (At Fontevrault, near Chinon, there were monks and nuns on the same abbey foundation.) Courtesy and well-mannered jollity reigned in this abbey, and when a gentleman had met the lady with whom bonds of mutual sympathy grew up, they went forth from the monastery to live a happy married life. Over

[1] Cf. p. 24.

the door was the inscription "Fay ce que vouldras," for, says Rabelais, people of free and goodly birth, well brought up, dwelling together in righteous intercourse, have by nature an instinct and prick which withdraws them from vice and impels them to virtue: "lequel ils nomment honneur." Thus Rabelais expresses the idea of the Humanists, as opposed to the Calvinistic Reformers, that nature is good. But it is not the primitive nature of Rousseau; it is rather the nature of well-bred gentlemen and ladies.

The second book of Rabelais (the first of *Pantagruel*) has many resemblances to the previous one but is somewhat inferior. Pantagruel, son of Gargantua, now spoken of as king of Utopia, comes to Paris to study, after visiting many centres of learning in France, as Rabelais himself is supposed to have done. He acquires such fame as an upholder of theses that he is called on to settle intricate legal questions, which he does by brushing aside the glosses of the Bartholists and Accursians and judging by common sense: he defeats in a disputation a learned Englishman named Thaumast, supposed to be Sir Thomas More. He attaches to himself as companion Panurge, the faithful but tricky clerk, who embodies features of almost every *picaro* and cowardly rogue in literature and who is the anti-hero of the romance. Pantagruel returns home on learning that the Dipsodes or Thirsty Ones have invaded Utopia, and defeats them.

The *tiers livre*, written a number of years after the first two, shows the evolution of Rabelais's mind: there is less humorous narrative and more discussion. Moreover, the giant theme is now practically abandoned, and the characters are treated as ordinary human beings. The book is largely taken up with the uncertainties of Panurge, as to whether he should take unto himself a wife, and with the various forms of consultation he goes through. At last, he and Pantagruel, who is not married himself, decide to make a journey to consult the oracle of the Holy Bottle. They lay in a large supply of pantagruelion, a

plant in which commentators recognise hemp. The third book, with its discussion of the relations of the sexes, involves many questions of social Platonism and the position of women as treated in the sixteenth century.

. The *quart livre*, the form of which was partly suggested by Lucian, is the account of the trip to the oracle of the Holy Bottle of the priestess Bacbuc. It is without doubt based geographically on the search for the Northwest Passage, though M. Lefranc has identified Rabelais's allusions with almost too great ingenuity. Finally, in the last book, after further adventures, many of which imply satire of religious disputes and of scholastic philosophy, the travellers reach the island of the Bottle, where they consult the oracle, and receive in answer the word "Trinch" (Drink).

This brief summary may give an idea of the growth of Rabelais's mind, and his use of fiction to touch upon nearly all the topics discussed in his day. We can understand the circumstances which transform a rollicking satire, masquerading under the form of a narrative of giants who live in Rabelais's own district, into a philosophical journey to symbolical places, in which the author himself takes part. It shows that Rabelais was, after all, no fantastic thinker, but clung very firmly to the concrete, and that his criticism dealt with defects in the life of his time in religion, education, law or medicine, which met him face to face. More especially, to the modern student the accounts of the education of Gargantua and Pantagruel, and the letter of Gargantua to his son are essential for the understanding of the Humanistic reform in education, and are usually studied in connection with Montaigne's essay on the bringing up of children.

The reply of the oracle has a vaticinic vagueness, due perhaps to the fact that Rabelais may have intended to continue his narrative still further. But it does not take much ingenuity to read into it advice to drink deeply of learning as well as of wine, even though "de vin, divin on devient." Wine helps to

give cheer to one's attitude in life, for not only does Rabelais tell us at the start that "rire est le propre de l'homme," but his philosophy is what he terms "Pantagruelism," and this he defines as "certaine gayeté d'esprit conficte en mespris des choses fortuites." To meet life cheerily and look on the better side of things, feeling that it is good to be alive and that the world is a place to enjoy, is what Rabelais preaches, a philosophy which is reproduced in the "Shandeeism" of Sterne's Uncle Toby. It is not to be expected, therefore, that Rabelais could feel much sympathy for Reformers of the Calvinistic type. His unpleasant monastic experiences and his aversion for the corrupt life he saw about him made him incline to the new religion, and this friar, monk and priest was ever ready to criticise the degenerate condition of his own faith. But he had no desire to be burned as a heretic: he was willing to go "jusqu'au feu *exclusivement*." Consequently, he adopted the method of most Humanists, remained a Catholic, toned down the vigor of his earlier attacks on the Sorbonne and, with all sincerity, reviled the gloomy asceticism of Calvin.

Allusion has already been made to two of the chief difficulties in the enjoyment of Rabelais nowadays: his indecency and his tremendously rich vocabulary. The former is partly explainable, partly excusable, leaving at any rate only a smaller part to apologise for. It must never be forgotten that the frankness of speech in the sixteenth century among men and women was extraordinarily free: Marguerite de Navarre's writings are a proof of this; it must not be forgotten either, that even the French of today are much more ready to speak of bodily functions without any idea of "shocking" than the modern Anglo-Saxons, and that the readily accepted *esprit gaulois* contains manure. Any contemporary novel or boulevard play of scatology is said to "sortir d'une veine riche et savoureuse" or to "fleurer le franc terroir gaulois." As to pornography or sexual indecency, we must remember that Rabelais's *bourgeois* class was never much affected by high ideals of women or the Platonism which he does

admit into his own writings, and that as a friar and monk he probably knew little of good women: "ni ne me soucie d'elle ni d'aucune autre," as he says of the death of Gargantua's mother Gargamelle. Moreover, as his life progressed, his opinion of women improved, and with the third book he holds them in more respect. Finally, it should never be forgotten that there is nothing decadent in Rabelais's obscenity. There is none of the insidious, unnatural and neurotic vice of many modern French writers. It either does not affect one, or its exaggerations may be tedious and even disgusting, but nobody was ever led by Rabelais into sin. At most he would tempt you to eat too much dinner or excuse yourself for getting drunk on a spree.

Rabelais's vocabulary is a mark of his genius. He took delight in the mere sound of words and, not being hampered by any theories of classical restraint, he yielded partly to the pleasure of heaping up language, now inventing phrases, now borrowing local sayings from all the dialects known to him, now ransacking Greek and Latin with a Humanist's passion. Some chapters of Rabelais are but lists of terms.

Thus Rabelais expresses in forms of genius the spirit of the sturdy, prosaic, practical, nimble-witted middle-class Frenchman, quick to detect shams and turn them inside out. There are more of these people in provincial France today than the foreigner quite realises, and it is they who make the true strength of the French race.

There were, in the sixteenth century, other authors of tales long or short, belonging to the type of the writings of Rabelais and the *Heptameron* of Marguerite de Navarre. Many of these works were influenced by the Italian stories which were translated, as Bandello by Pierre Boistuau and François de Belleforest (1559) or the *Piacevoli notti* of Straparola by Jean Louveau (1560).

Jean Bonaventure des Périers (circa 1510–1544), secretary of Marguerite de Navarre, was the author not only of verses and of satirical anti-religious dialogues influenced by Lucian, called

the *Cymbalum mundi*, which got him into trouble, but of the posthumous *Nouvelles Recréations et joyeux Devis*, consisting of brisk stories. Guillaume Bouchet (1513–1593 or 4) wrote the *Sérées;* Noël du Fail (1526 [or 7]–1591) wrote the *Propos rustiques*, the *Baliverneries, ou contes nouveaux d'Eutrapel* and the *Contes et discours d'Eutrapel.* François Béroalde de Verville (1558–1612) was the author of the *Moyen de parvenir*, published about 1610.

CHAPTER VI

THE PLÉIADE AND ITS THEORIES

SAYS Etienne Pasquier in the *Recherches de la France:* "Ce fut une belle guerre que l'on entreprit lors contre l'ignorance, dont j'attribue l'avant-garde à Scève, Bèze et Peletier, ou si le voulez autrement, ce furent les avant-coureurs des autres poètes. Après se mirent sur les rangs Pierre de Ronsard, Vendômois, et Joachim du Bellay, Angevin." Elsewhere he adds of Peletier that he was "le premier qui mit nos poètes français hors de page."

These three writers, then, seem to stand out in Pasquier's mind. But they do not exhaust the list if we extend it to include not only the foes to ignorance, but the formative influences of the Pléiade as well. Such a list must contain not only Lemaire or Héroët, but the leaders of the old school, Marot and Saint-Gelais, or even the prosaic verse of a minor *rhétoriqueur* like Jean Bouchet, *traverseur des voies périlleuses* (1476–c. 1558). Moreover, we must add to these old lists the name of Lazare de Baïf.

Even Théodore de Bèze, so much better known as a Reformer, is rather a symptom than an influence, and that in his earlier years. When studying at Orleans in his teens he wrote a number of Latin erotic poems, many of them in praise of a certain Candida, inspired by Catullus, Propertius, Tibullus and Ovid. Of these verses, many of which are but Latin Petrarchism, Bèze was afterwards heartily ashamed. Nevertheless, the effort to unite Humanism and pure literature, even in Latin lyric verse, helps to pave the way for the Pléiade. The same credit may be given to the other great Latin lyric poets of the day: Jean Salmon Maigret (Macrinus), the "French Horace," Nic-

olas Bourbon and Jean Visagier or Faciot (Vulteius, Voulté). The Latin poems of Du Bellay himself are among the best of the century.

Jacques Peletier (1517–1582) is significant in the history of the Pléiade. He expounds its theories in his *Art of Poetry*, and is actually one of the first to enunciate them as early as the dedication of his translation of Horace's *Art of Poetry* in 1544 and his own poetical works in 1547. Moreover, Peletier occupies an important place in the history of the ode and of the sonnet. He knew Ronsard and Du Bellay before they had met, knew Ronsard's early attempts to cultivate the Horatian ode and advised Du Bellay to study the ode and sonnet.

Lazare de Baïf (1496?–1547) ambassador to Venice and high in favor with Francis I, had imbibed a love for Hellenism and antiquity in general under Lascaris and the Candiot scholar Marcus Musurus, and had translated Greek plays and written scholarly treatises in Latin. But his influence on the Pléiade was more personal. He was the father of Jean-Antoine de Baïf, the intimate friend of Ronsard, and Lazare affectionately alluded to the two youths together as "mes enfants."

It is at last with Ronsard and the Pléiade that French poetry becomes impregnated with Humanism, and that we find this installed in all parts of French literature and of the French Renaissance. By the installation of Humanism we are to understand the domination in belles-lettres of the qualities already studied in their learned form, the combination of the love for Greece with that of Rome and the desire to renew their power in modern literature. By the installation of the Renaissance we understand the sway of the spirit of individualism and of free emotion which finds its clearest expression in lyric poetry, with emphasis laid upon the self, or ego.

The Pléiade was a small group of Humanistic poets aiming to introduce the Renaissance spirit of freedom in the sphere of letters, and seeking to accomplish this end by steeping French letters in antiquity. This goal was not to be reached by a ser-

vile imitation of classical forms of expression, for then the result would be a bastard Greek or Latin, but by assimilation of all that was good in those languages. Latin and Greek learning would be the tonic by which French would be strengthened and purified. The members of the Pléiade were, then, not technical Hellenists or Ciceronians. They were firmly convinced of the possibilities of French, and it was to express their opinion that Du Bellay wrote the *Défense et Illustration de la langue française.*

There has been much misunderstanding as to the purpose of the Pléiade, and as to the importance of this "manifesto." Superficial features have often led people into misinterpretations. Only of late years a closer study of the sixteenth century enables us to correct our predecessors and see what the Pléiade really was about.

Thus some were misled by statements of Ronsard himself, such as:

> Ceux qui ces vers liront,
> S'ils ne sont et Grecs et Romains,
> Au lieu de livre n'auront
> Qu'un pesant faix entre les mains.

Or take, again, the often quoted passage:

> Ah! que je suis marry que la langue françoise
> Ne peut dire ces mots, comme fait la Gregeoise,
> Ocymore, dispotme, oligochronien.

People seeing these words, as well as Du Bellay's "nostre langue n'est si copieuse que la Grecque ou Latine," concluded that French was not good enough for Ronsard and Du Bellay, and that what they wanted was to turn French into a mere imitation of the dead languages. This is far from being the case, though in practice they did often fall into the very vices they were arguing against. It is true that they thought French less rich than Greek and Latin. But their remedy was, not to transform French into those languages, but to make French come to a fuller consciousness of its own possibilities. Greek and Latin are necessary only as a means to an end, and the Greek and

Latin literatures are more essential than the Greek and Latin languages. Thus the above quotations are explained: Ronsard does not want to write a pseudo-Greek (though he sometimes does write it), but his poems are so full of allusions to classical material that, as we should say, only a man with a liberal education can understand them. And as for the words *dispotme* and *oligochronien*, he does not intend to introduce them into French, but merely regrets that French has them not.

The Pléiade, then, was a group of literary men like so many which have been important influences in French literature. The title covered a vague number of writers united by common interests. But because of the name it is customary to consider the group as really made up of seven men. This list even varies a little. The usual enumeration is that of Ronsard's biographer Claude Binet, and includes Ronsard, Du Bellay, Jean-Antoine de Baïf, Belleau, Dorat, Jodelle and Thyard. Dorat was merely a pedagogue, and Thyard was known in literature before the times of the Pléiade. For these two names we sometimes find stated those of Marc-Antoine de Muret and Scévole de Sainte-Marthe. Binet adds Etienne Pasquier, Olivier de Magny, Jean de la Péruse, Amadis Jamyn, Robert Garnier, Florent Chrestien, Jean Passerat, Philippe Desportes, Jacques Davy Du Perron and Jean Bertaut. Etienne Pasquier, himself included in the above enumeration, adds Jacques Tahureau, Guillaume des Autels, Nicolas Denisot (known by his anagram of comte d'Alsinois), Louis le Caron, Claude de Buttet and Louis Desmasures. The name of the band was at first the Brigade during the days when Ronsard was a student. Then they called themselves or were called the Pléiade from the group of seven poets gathered at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Thus their two names symbolise two of the strongest influences on on the moulding of the Pléiade, Italianism (*brigata*) and Alexandrinism.[1]

[1] M. Laumonier has an important note, if we accept all his conclusions, in his critical edition of Binet's *Vie de Ronsard* (p. 219 ff.). He thinks that

The undoubted leader of the group was Pierre de Ronsard (1524–1585), born in the northern centre of France in the district of Vendômois. During his youth he travelled widely through Europe, partly as a page in households of rank, with the expectation of following a diplomatic career. But deafness following illness at the age of sixteen made him change his plans, and he resolved to become a student of the classics. He put himself under the guidance of Dorat and entered the Collège de Coqueret with Jean-Antoine, son of Lazare de Baïf, one of his patrons. Later Ronsard met Du Bellay and persuaded him to become one of the votaries of the Muses.

In 1549 appeared the *Défense*, which met the opposition of the old school and criticism finding expression in the *Quintil-Horatian* of Barthélemy Aneau. But the Pléiade soon triumphed, and through the reigns of Henry II, Francis II and Charles IX, Ronsard was the honored poet of the court and a very different one from Saint-Gelais. His position is testified to by the verses, now acknowledged to be apocryphal, attributed to Charles IX:

> Tous deux également nous portons des couronnes,
> Mais Roi, je la reçus, Poète tu la donnes.

the term Brigade was the current one during most of Ronsard's life and that Ronsard was not responsible for the more specific term Pléiade, which was originally due rather to Huguenot writers. Ronsard did, as early as 1553, distinguish a smaller *élite* among the indeterminate Brigade, adopting the limitation of seven suggested by the name "Pléiade," and he mentions ("assez discrètement d'ailleurs") in an elegy to La Péruse: Du Bellay, Thyard, Baïf, Des Autels, Jodelle, La Péruse. On the death of the last writer Ronsard put Belleau in his stead and afterward replaced Des Autels by Peletier. "Telle fut la vraie composition de la Pléiade française, avec ses variations, de 1553 à 1560. Du Bellay mort, il est possible que Dorat 'poeta et interpres regius' ait passé pour la septième étoile aux yeux des huguenots, quand ils disaient 'messieurs de la Pléiade' en parlant de leurs adversaires poètes. Mais, dans tous les cas, Binet, qui eut d'ailleurs grandement raison de compter Du Bellay parmi les 'sept,' eut tort de sacrifier Des Autels ou Peletier, pour pouvoir faire figurer Dorat dans ce nombre. Malheureusement son témoignage a prévalu."

From him he received several clerical benefices, though it has always remained a disputed point whether Ronsard was actually a priest or only a lay prior.

Under the reign of Henry III, though still esteemed and famous, he was less a personal favorite of the reigning monarch. He spent much of his time in the country at his priories of Croixval and Saint-Cosme, at which latter place near Tours he died. And soon he fell into oblivion.

Next in importance came Joachim du Bellay, *gentilhomme angevin* (1522 [or 4 or 5]–1560), one of those poets whose biographies are intimately bound up with their works. Alfred de Musset on his mother's side was connected with the Du Bellay family, which also distinguished itself in the sixteenth century in the persons of Joachim's cousins the brothers Guillaume du Bellay de Langey, a diplomat, Martin, a judge and author of memoirs, René, a bishop, and the Cardinal du Bellay, with whom Joachim lived in Italy for about three years. This Italian journey was a turning point in his life. Deafness, from which he as well as Ronsard suffered, and resulting melancholy growing up in one shut in himself among the remains of a vanished civilisation, in the hotbed of a corrupt modern one, the enervating atmosphere of Rome, all this affected his life and poetry. It was in Rome that he wrote his *Antiquités*, to which is added the *Songe* or *Vision*, both dwelling on the past might of Rome and both imitated by Spenser. To the same influence are due the *Regrets*, in which, after the novelty of Italy has passed away, Du Bellay begins to long for home and the "douceur angevine." He feels himself an exile from home, and his *Regrets* have been compared to the *Tristia* of Ovid exiled at Tomi. He returned to France and languished until his death from overwork and ill health.

Du Bellay was a poet with individuality which, as Sainte-Beuve said, had a peculiar quality of "*intimité*." We feel in Du Bellay the element of personality and the outpourings of a human mind. We feel more sympathy for him than for Ronsard,

who tried so much in so many ways. Ronsard was a poet of wider intellectual range; Du Bellay appeals to more readers.

Jean Antoine de Baïf (1532–1589) was Italian on his mother's side and was born in Venice. He travelled a great deal and was led by his recollection of the harmonious Greek reading of one of his early teachers, Angelo Vergecio, to spend much time trying to remodel French prosody. He wished to introduce blank verse based on quantity as in ancient poetry, invented the *vers baïfin* of fifteen syllables and attempted reformed spelling. By 1571, with the help of Charles IX, he had established an Academy or Conservatory for poets and musicians. Under the reign of Henry III this became the Académie du Palais for the discussion of philosophy as much as poetry and music, but Baïf had wished to study the sounds of language, hence, as well as music, grammar, philology, and even dancing to revive the choral odes of tragedy.

On account of Baïf's complicated attempts at reform and the laughing verses of Du Bellay on the "docte, doctieur et doctime Baïf," he has been considered the pedant of the Pléiade. But Baïf's defect was rather an unscholarly haste than the pedant's involutions.

Jean Dorat (1501 or 2–1588) was the principal of the Collège de Coqueret, whither pupils came from all parts of Europe. The power of Dorat, which seems to have been extraordinary, was purely that of a teacher. His writings, chiefly in Latin, are of no value.

Pontus de Thyard (1521–1605) published the first book of his *Erreurs amoureuses* soon after the appearance of the *Défense* and the *Olive*. He immediately joined the new group, on the Platonism of which he probably had an influence through his translation of Leo Judæus. His name is also connected with the early history of the sonnet in France. His devotion to Henry III won him the hostility of the Ligue, although he was a bishop. He was the last survivor of the Pléiade, of which he was one of the senior members, and of which he may be called the philosopher, though his philosophy was vague and misty.

Of Remy Belleau, *le gentil Belleau*, not much is known and his career was probably uneventful. He was an inseparable friend of Ronsard, born about 1527. His chief work was a translation of Anacreon. He died in 1577. Finally Etienne Jodelle (1532–1573) was the dramatic writer of the Pléiade.

The *Défense et Illustration de la langue française* is the most important critical work in French in the sixteenth century, and, indeed, begins modern French criticism. Previous works, like the treatises of *seconde rhétorique*, had been mere descriptions of metrical forms. It is only with the *Art of Poetry* of Thomas Sebillet or Sibilet that we need pause to find anything new. And even this, though its date brings us down to the year preceding the *Défense*, and though it mentions some of the new *genres* which will become important, is nevertheless an exponent of the school of Marot, with its few innovations. Sebillet was a transition writer and ultimately went over to the new principles, but his work does not yet present them in a fully developed form. In fact, the *Défense* is in many respects a reply to Sebillet.

Sebillet's favorites among modern poets are Marot, Saint-Gelais, Salel, Héroët and Scève. Though he devotes a certain amount of attention at the opening of his work to questions which agitated the innovators, such as Art and Invention, still the first book is mainly taken up with the discussion of points of prosody. Under this heading he finds greatest elegance in the *rime équivoque*, of which he takes as example Marot's preposterous "En m'esbatant je fay rondeaux en rithme."

In the second book Sebillet discusses the various poetic types, his list containing a mixture of the old and the new: Epigramme, sonnet, rondeau, ballade, chant royal, cantique, chant lyrique or ode and chanson, épître, élégie, dialogue (with its divisions églogue, moralité and farce), coq-à-l'âne, blason, énigme, complainte, lai and virelai, version or translation.

The theories of the Pléiade are set forth in the *Défense*, the preface of Du Bellay's *Olive*, Ronsard's *Abrégé de l'Art poétique*, the two prefaces of the *Franciade* and the *Art poëtique* of Jacques

Peletier. The preface to the *Olive* contains but little that is not in the larger work, and the prefaces to the *Franciade* are mainly connected with the epic *genre*. Peletier's composition is, in some respects, the most useful to the student of literary evolution, inasmuch as it gives, in systematic form, details of the various *genres* which are mentioned in an indiscriminate way in other writings.

The gist of the argument of the *Défense* (1549) is:

That the French language has been unjustly treated and deemed unworthy of comparison with the language of the ancients. Let us defend it (*défense*);

That it may still be improved or ennobled (*illustration*).

The French language, then, is not *barbare*. For, though it lacks much of the wealth of Greek and Latin, this is because it has been neglected. It may be much improved by the use of the classics of Greece and Rome. But we must not confine ourselves to a mere servile translation of these writings. Let there be imitation, but let it be an intelligent one, the absorption of the qualities of the old languages, so that the results may be new and original. There is a proper use of Greek and Latin as well as an abuse of them, and it is because of a too servile cult of authors whom we cannot expect to equal in their own language that education is defective, the progress of science slower than it might be. Admire, then, and appreciate the ancients, but develop your own language.

The second book attempts to show how French, particularly French poetry, may be improved and made a more fitting instrument for the expression of those qualities of which it is capable, and expounds with characteristic disorder the practical rules for the attainment of this goal. First comes a brief and imperfect discussion of French poets, in which scarcely any get praise except the authors of the *Roman de la Rose* and Lemaire de Belges. Du Bellay rebukes those who do not know how to draw from their own language all its merits. But natural qualities do not suffice, for long and patient toil is also necessary.

The poet must discard as well the old literary types and such *épiceries*. He should turn to the epigram such as Martial wrote, the heart-moving elegies of Ovid, Tibullus and Propertius, the ode with the harmony of the Greek and Latin lyre, the epistle, the satire if kept free from the inept *coq-à-l'âne*, the sonnet which Petrarch taught, the eclogues of Theocritus, Virgil and Sannazaro, the tragedy and comedy long degraded by the farces and moralities. Above all, let the poet try the epic, revive the old French stories of Lancelot and Tristan or give to France a new Iliad or Æneid. In the composition of these new works many innovations may be permitted in French, such as old words revived or expressions wherein Du Bellay, as Estienne, sees a harmony between French and Greek. And in the use of his new terms the poet should seek skilled guidance, he should study science and even the mechanic arts, so that the terms may become familiar to him. But this must not prevent him from having a noble idea of poesy and from soaring high, even if he have but few readers. And Du Bellay ends with a last trumpet blast exhorting the French to write in their own language.

Ronsard's views are in harmony with these exhortations to study the ancients and renew their spirit in French. In his brief sketch of the Art of Poetry he tells us that a prime requisite is to have noble conceptions. "Le principal point est l'invention." This invention is due both to natural endowment and to the study of the ancients. The poet must study good authors, and to a knowledge of Greek and Latin he must add his own mother tongue, which he may use even to the extent of reviving archaic or technical terms and words borrowed from the various dialects. And like Du Bellay, Ronsard exclaims: "Those who first dared to abandon the language of the ancients to honor that of their own country were truly good children and not ungrateful citizens, worthy of being crowned upon a public stage with lasting memory of them and of their deeds from age to age."

The *Art poëtique* of Peletier is more systematic than the *Défense*. It is the work of a more mature man whose mind was mathematical and logical. It was not openly recognised as the creed of the group, yet it contains the theories which the Pléiade put into practice. It appeared, moreover, in 1555, when the views had taken shape. It is divided into two books, of which the first deals with general topics concerning poetry, the second discusses the specific types.

Thus, in the first book, the author begins with the antiquity and excellence of poetry, holding to its "celestial" origin and quoting "divine" Plato as saying that the poets are the interpreters of the gods when they are in their frenzy. Passing to the claims of nature and of art or practice, he tries to reconcile both. The poet must imitate nature and have his seasons. His study will be his winter, his invention his spring, his composition the summer, his fame autumn. Thus nature will be diffused through all his work, and art mingled with his nature. And in this connection he gives a list of those poets of his day who find favor with him: Saint-Gelais, Ronsard, Du Bellay, Maurice Scève, Pontus de Thyard, Desmasures, Baïf, Jodelle, Héroët, and Marot.[1]

Peletier then takes up the subjects appropriate to poetry and discusses the difference between the poet and the orator. The favorite topics with poets have always been wars, love, *la pastoralité*, and agriculture, of which love has always been the chief in France and has been sadly overdone. He regrets that so few have followed Marot's example in composing eclogues (Ronsard was soon to do so), and proclaims wars to be the most

[1] His epithets are interesting, even in his queer spelling: Saint-Gelais, "dous, facond, e nè aus oreilhes des Princes"; Ronsard, "sublime, e raporteur de la Poësie ancienne"; Du Bellay, "elegant e ingenieus"; Scève, "grave e parfond an invancions"; Pontus, "net e sutil"; Desmasures, "propre e dilig'ant"; Baïf, "studieus e fluide"; Jodelle, "impetueus e plein de chaleur Poëtique." His high praise of Héroët and Marot is less specific. Marot had but the defect "de n'avouer voulu grand'chose."

dignified topic for poetry. Finally, he speaks of the broader scope of the poet's work over that of the orator, and hints strongly at a separation between the language of poetry and that of common speech.

The other important sections of the first part are on imitation, translation and writing in French. The poet should steep himself in the great writers, Homer and Virgil for the epic, so that when they are incorporated in him he may add something of his own, and he should above all use his own language. The interesting portion of the second part is the classification of the *genres*. The comments on the epigram add nothing new. The sonnet must be noble in its conclusion, elaborately wrought and philosophical in its conception. "The name of ode," says Peletier, "was introduced in our day by Pierre de Ronsard, to whom I shall not fail to testify that, while he was still very young, he showed me some of his composition in our town of Le Mans and told me even then that he planned this kind of writing in imitation of Horace: as he has since shown all Frenchmen, and even beyond his first purpose, in imitation of the first of lyric writers, Pindar." The thing itself he acknowledges not to be new: the Psalms of Marot are true odes. This was the position of the author of the *Quintil-Horatian* in his attack on Du Bellay.

The epistle comes between the epigram and the true lyric poem. The elegy, once confined to melancholy topics, may now be cheerful and deals much with love. The satire is as yet not fully established and is of but little consequence. Classicism here outgrew Peletier's view, to which he was perhaps inclined by the lack of dignity of Marot's *coq-à-l'âne*. Comedy is the mirror of life and has but one resemblance with tragedy, the division into five acts. For the characters of comedy are of low degree, in tragedy they are noble; comedy has a joyous issue, tragedy ends horribly. But to Peletier the heroic poem is by far the noblest. It is the ocean to which all other styles are but as rivers, and he discusses fully many of the qualities

of Virgil, who is to him the master poet. Finally, the treatise ends with the conditions of the true poet. Along with natural endowments he must have that encyclopedic learning which to the sixteenth-century Humanist went hand in hand with true poetry. He must know astrology, cosmography, geometry, physics, philosophy, the art of war, as well as the naval and mechanical professions.

Such is a brief survey of the chief theoretic writings of the Pléiade at the time of its advent to power. The central point is the doctrine of Imitation, Innutrition, Assimilation or whatever name we may give to this form of invention. It is the result of that inward chewing and digesting of books of which Bacon speaks. It is what André Chénier expresses by the following image in one of his fragments:

> Je veux qu'on imite les anciens;
> Comme aux bords d'Eurotas. . . .
> Lorsqu'une épouse est près du terme de Lucine,
> On suspend devant elle en un riche tableau,
> Ce que l'art de Zeuxis anima de plus beau,
> Apollon et Bacchus, Hyacinthe, Nirée,
> Avec les deux Gémeaux leur sœur tant désirée.
> L'épouse les contemple; elle nourrit ses yeux
> De ces objets, honneur de la terre et des cieux;
> Et de son flanc rempli de ces formes nouvelles,
> Sort un fruit noble et beau comme ces beaux modèles.

It is almost the thought that the same poet utters in a more often quoted passage from a better known poem, *l'Invention:*

> Changeons en notre miel leur plus antiques fleurs;
> Pour peindre notre idée empruntons leurs couleurs;
> Allumons nos flambeaux à leurs feux poétiques;
> Sur des pensers nouveaux faisons des vers antiques.

The poet, in fine, must saturate himself with antiquity so that his productions may be fairer and more noble, like their noble prototypes.

This doctrine has its literary and historical aspects. In its

deeper sense one might call it a form of the doctrine of reminiscence or ἀνάμνησις dear to poets from Plato to Shelley and Wordsworth, that the spirit of an earlier existence makes itself felt anew at a later time. From the historical point of view it comes from Quintilian and more recently from Vida, who, along with Horace, is one of the chief foreign inspirers of Du Bellay's *Défense*. The theory of assimilation of what is good in antiquity goes hand in hand with the assumption of the divine quality in poetry resulting from the divine origin of the poet. The thought runs through the work of Ronsard and Du Bellay, particularly Ronsard's ode to Michel de l'Hospital, that the poet is inspired by ἡ ἀπὸ μουσῶν μανία, that he is their interpreter, and the prophet of the Gods. But here comes the sad conclusion to the fine theories: Du Bellay cribbed the main ideas of the *Défense* itself from the Italian writer Sperone Speroni, and the sonnets of the *Olive*, instead of being inspired by the ancients, were mainly adapted from Ariosto and from living poets, whom he knew through easily accessible anthologies.

CHAPTER VII

THE PLÉIADE AND ITS WORK

THE theory of the Pléiade, stated in its briefest form, we have seen to be: Let us ennoble poetry. If necessary we may have two languages, one for poetry and one for prose. And this result would not have been inconceivable in French, as is the case to a certain degree in English, had not Malherbe made poetry prosaic in its vocabulary and style.

This ambition of the Pléiade was far from being a democratic one: it did not take into consideration all national life. It accepted literature as the inheritance of an *élite*, the educated groups and court society of Paris. It continued the "odi profanum vulgus" of Horace, the "seguite pochi e non la volgar gente" of Petrarch, the contempt of the Italian poets of the Renaissance for the *popolaccio* and *canaglia*. Says Du Bellay:

> Rien ne me plaît, fors ce qui peut déplaire
> Au jugement du rude populaire.

The effect of the Pléiade is to substitute for the literature of the Middle Ages another based on antiquity, becoming itself a sort of pseudo-antique. Even in the seventeenth century and the great days of Classicism, French literature preserved certain traits of unoriginality or of secondary genius to which is given the technical name of Alexandrinism.

The efforts of the Pléiade involved the danger of falling into exaggeration, to which an imitative literature is liable. When the first impetus was over and Ronsard himself was gone, there came a time which we can in a way compare with the days of the *rhétoriqueurs*. Only here, instead of an absolutely meaningless

cult for form which distinguished Molinet or Cretin, the poets of the end of the sixteenth century were beset with the Italianism pervading the court and society and finding vent in a bastard Petrarchism.

Nor is the result surprising. Italian influences had kept on increasing from the beginning of the century. Italian wars and marriages had spread the tendencies, and when Henry III in 1574 halted in Italy on his way back from Poland the stay was a revelation to him. So that French in the court circles became a *pastiche* of Italian, stuffed with foreign words and phrases. This was the tendency that Estienne attacked so violently.

Since things were taking this course, one need not wonder that French poets, deprived of a great leader, should have dropped to an inferior level. And so a change was necessary if poetry was not to fall into exaggerations of expression fully as ludicrous as those of the fifteenth century. The sin is no longer the composition of poems to be read equally well backwards or upside down, but the indulging in excessive antitheses, refinements of hyperbole and *pointes*, constant allusions in poetry to lips like coral or roses, set in cheeks of snow, encircling ivory teeth, to hair like gold, to eyes darting arrows or rays of fire which burn or blind all they touch.

It was from this condition of literature that Malherbe came to deliver things, soon after the end of the Valois dynasty. The growth of rationalism had gone on, and it was preparing to impose its authority. The "fay ce que vouldras" of the abbaye de Thélème of the sixteenth century was to be replaced by the absolutism of the seventeenth. Malherbe was the high priest of the movement of repression in poetry, which ruthlessly cut away all the superabundant wealth of the language of Ronsard and the tawdriness of Desportes, drawing the language back to the prose from which it had deviated, chastening that prose itself until the result was a calm and impersonal style, bereft of individuality and lyric qualities, a fit medium for the *lieux communs* which constitute so much of the literature of

Classicism. Malherbe, coming as the foe of Ronsard, plays the part of successor, and when he damns writers who, like Théophile, say,

> La règle me déplaît, j'écris confusément:
> Jamais un bon esprit ne fait rien qu'aisément,

he is merely picking from the Classicism of Ronsard the elements deserving to be perpetuated and rejecting what seems to him transitory. The enemy of the Pléiade was its successor, and the work of both Ronsard and his companions and that of Malherbe were useful.

But this is anticipating: the mistakes of Ronsard and of the first generation of the Pléiade, though numerous, are not so bad as those of Desportes and his followers.

The most important divisions of the literature of the Pléiade, apart from the drama, which will be treated elsewhere, were the ode, the sonnet, the epic and the pastoral. Each writer generally passed through a period of somewhat immature imitation, often of Petrarchism, before coming to his full development. The school was largely one of lyric poetry, Ronsard standing pre-eminent in the ode and Ronsard and Du Bellay in the sonnet.

The two terms Anacreontism and Horatianism give us the key to almost all the lyric odes of the Pléiade. The majority cultivated the *odelette* rather than the ode. Here and there they sound, in imitation of Ronsard, what Olivier de Magny calls the "pindarique buccine." One of the most ponderous buccinators was Ronsard's own teacher Dorat, one of whose Pindaric odes is addressed to Ronsard himself.

Early in life Ronsard became interested in the verses of Horace and took him as a model for his boyish compositions. This poetic mood appealed to him, for he returned to it more than once. About the middle of the century he had a passing attack of the Pindaric fever, lasting long enough for him to compose a handful of soaring odes. But when Henri Estienne published the Anacreontic poems Ronsard and his friends turned

with passion to the new models, and no one exclaimed more eagerly than he did:

> Loue qui voudra les replis recourbés
> Des torrens de Pindare à nos yeux embourbés,
> Obscurs, rudes, fascheux, et ses chansons connues,
> Je ne sais bien comment, par songes et par nues:
> Anacréon me plaist, le doux Anacréon.

Pindarism was, then, a temporary mood, though it affected Ronsard long enough to make his name by anagram "Rose de Pindare." It was the poetry of one discontented with the lyricism in a minor key of the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance. It was the attitude of one seeking to stand in the new life as Pindar in the old world, half priest of man, half interpreter of the Gods, the embodiment of divine inspiration or ἐνθουσιασμός uttering ῥήματα σεμνά.

The experiment was to be made of imitating the odes of Pindar with a due share of novelty and invention. Ronsard had a precursor in the Italian poet at the court of Francis I, Luigi Alamanni, from whose Pindaric hymns he borrowed the scheme of strophe, antistrophe and epode, besides ideas as to the number of syllables. But Ronsard came to grief. In these odes he did not put into practice his and Du Bellay's theory on assimilation. With punctilious exactness he tried to reproduce every feature of Pindarism, whether in the poetry or the setting. The setting or movement of the ode was in the lyric action and the combination of the elements of dance, music and song. But in trying to reproduce the sentiment and sing the modern equivalents of the old demi-gods and heroes, Ronsard crammed his poems with historical and mythological allusions, resulting in a noble but quite superfluous disorder, what Malherbe, Perrault and Voltaire were ready later to call the "galimatias de Pindare." He concealed the arrangement of ideas and imitated the passion of those who were carried away by the divine frenzy. Pindar's frenzy was not entirely unconscious. But there was a difference between voicing the aspirations of Greek thought,

its underlying principles of patience, hope, quiet, fear of the divinity and avoidance of envy, and attempting literary constructions not believed even by their author. Moreover, French metre was not adapted to Ronsard's purpose. The distinction of syllables is so slight that the ear with difficulty follows a complicated structure through the windings of the strophe and antistrophe.

In short, Ronsard's Pindaric odes were neither French nor Greek. They had, however, a brilliant success in his own day. The longest and most ambitious was addressed to Michel de l'Hospital. In it Ronsard relates the birth of the Muses, their visit to their father Jupiter while he is staying beneath the ocean, and then the rise, progress and decline of poesy, the sway of ignorance and the final revival of learning at the birth of the great chancellor. This involved tale is interspersed with learned literary and mythological allusions.

Fortunately, Ronsard is much more successful as an imitator of Horace and of Anacreon. Estienne's edition of the Anacreontic poems in 1554 created a furore among the members of the Pléiade. Ronsard again led the way, Belleau translated the poems, and a luscious epicureanism of Cupids, roses and wine was the order of the day. And here the writer of the sixteenth century is in general most successful. He lets his verse float on under the spell of authors whom he may imitate without strain, Anacreon, Marullus, Navagero, Secundus. And now it is that Ronsard and his fellow-poets put into practice with the most success his famous theory, and that we see them, as a result of the sympathetic study of the older poets, renew emotions and feelings and express them in words that are French. Even when Ronsard translates, as he frequently and openly does, his poems have a grace and originality of their own, though they remind one of the past on which they are built. Here we have possibly the best expression of Ronsard's talent and the nearest approach to the desired aim of the poet, the formation of new *genres* borrowed from the ancients, but created anew in the passage from one

language to the other by the genius of a poet whom the Muses cherish. The varied metres of these poems are also among Ronsard's best contributions to French poetry.[1]

The feelings at the basis of these odes is the old epicureanism, life in the present and neglect of the future, with an occasional melancholy sentiment over the fleeting quality of youth and beauty and the passage of time. Ronsard's famous ode to Cassandre, "Mignonne, allons voir si la rose" is too famous in this connection to bear repetition. Above all, Ronsard is fond of nature. Although for so many years a court poet and the favorite of princes, he preferred, or feigned to prefer, his priory of Saint-Cosme or his smiling Vendômois. The little Loir becomes his Anio, the fontaine Bellerie is his Bandusian spring and the forest of Gastine the country near Tibur. To a greater extent than with Du Bellay, Ronsard's emotions are expressed in borrowed terms, so that he seems the city man recognising the features that others have admired. To this extent he does not rise above Alexandrinism, but it is impossible not to acknowledge the charm of his invocations to forest and stream, to swallow and lark. The peculiarly Anacreontic qualities, interwoven with the Horatian ones, deal largely with the setting. Hence the source of the loves and doves, birds and bees of which the members of the Pléiade were so fond. One of the best examples is the story told both in the Anacreontic collection and by Theocritus, and imitated by Belleau, Baïf, Ronsard and Olivier de Magny among others, of Love stung by a bee. When he runs weeping to his mother Venus she draws a moral which Ronsard thus expresses:

Si donques un animal
Si petit fait tant de mal,
Quand son halesne espoinçonne

[1] The attitude of M. Laumonier in his book on Ronsard's lyric poetry is that of a new Quintil-Horatian. He seeks to diminish the novelty of Ronsard's contributions and show him to be a successor rather than an innovator.

La main de quelque personne,
Combien fais-tu de douleurs
Au prix de luy, dans les cœurs
De ceux contre qui tu jettes
Tes homicides sagettes?

Ronsard's nature phraseology is often of Italian inspiration: Belleau is one of the best nature painters, but his descriptions are objective; Du Bellay puts us in a more vivid relationship with it. In his poems we see more distinct and less hackneyed features of the landscape, the smoke rising above the country cottage or the fields and harvests. The poem of the countryman and the breezes, "A vous troupe légère," imitated from Navagero's Latin *Vota ad auras* is more natural than anything in Ronsard.

In actual numbers it was the sonnet and not the ode that swamped the sixteenth century. Here the imitation of the Italian Petrarchists was most rampant, and the French sonnet writers became in turn the models for countless plagiarisms in English literature. The French poets borrowed the name of the *Amores* of Ovid and wrote their *Amours*, a title used by Ronsard, Baïf and Olivier de Magny, besides the *Olive* of Du Bellay and the *Erreurs amoureuses* of Pontus de Thyard. They deliberately took a lady to adore, whether in a literary mood or with genuine feeling. Said Pasquier: "Lorsque nos poètes discourent le mieux de l'amour, c'est lorsqu'ils sont moins atteints de maladie." Ronsard wrote sonnets to Cassandre, Marie and Hélène as well as to many others, Du Bellay to Olive, Baïf to Méline and Francine, Belleau to Magdelon and Catin, Jodelle to Diane and Claire, Thyard to Pasithée. The Pléiade drew largely for inspiration from the Italian Bembists, who represented, on the whole, a more polished form of Petrarchism than the school of Serafino and who had gone back to the sonnet in place of the *strambotto*.

The characteristics of Petrarchism were: Forced metaphor and similes running into each other, so that often the original subject of interest was quite lost to view; constant allegory,

not of personified qualities as in the Middle Ages, but of hearts driven to and fro like barks in distress; over-indulgence in mythological allusions, so that the explanations of commentators seemed often necessary; repeated antitheses and, later, *pointes;* laments of the unhappy lover and complaints about the cruel coquette who makes him suffer agony so long that he seems to take joy in his woe; elaborate and sensuous descriptions of the beauty adored.[1]

In spite of these defects many of the sonnets have great charm, particularly those of Ronsard to Hélène de Surgères. These date from his maturity, and represent a much quieter passion than the earlier ones. They often show, rather than a worship, the companionship of an older person for a young girl; they are more intellectual and give hints of the solemnity of approaching age. One of these sonnets, the famous "Quand vous serez bien vieille, au soir, à la chandelle," shares with the ode to Cassandre mentioned above the widespread thought of youth and beauty passing like the rose, and renewed in modern literature the reminder of the immortality that the poet can give.

Together with the Pindaric ode, the epic was Ronsard's most ambitious endeavor and his worst failure. Ronsard was unequal to the composition of the highest *genres*, yet the *Franciade* was the darling of his heart, and its completion was the dream of a large part of his life. To the sixteenth century the epic was the result of long incubation, and the more laborious the poet, the more he seemed suited to express the epic qualities. Virgil was, therefore, generally a greater favorite than Homer, and

[1] Cf. Vianey, *Le Pétrarquisme en France* (p. 22): "Tebaldeo fut, sans que la plupart d'eux s'en soient doutés, le père de presque tous les sonnettistes français. C'est lui, en effet, qui inventa cette technique du sonnet que nos poètes ont empruntée à Du Bellay, celle qui, pour répéter un mot connu, 'fait le sonnet sentir son épigramme.' En d'autres termes, il imagina de construire tout le sonnet en vue de préparer, d'amener, de souligner, de renforcer le dernier vers, devenu la pièce maîtresse de l'édifice. Le sonnet de Pétrarque était quelque chose de bien plus délicat et de bien plus varié."

Ronsard, in spite of his own statements, has rather followed Virgil. But even truer models are the erudite Alexandrian Apollonius Rhodius and the modern Ariosto. The subject, the story of Francus and the origins of the French, Ronsard took from Lemaire de Belges; the treatment consisted in bringing together a medley of episodes drawn without assimilation from older writers, weighed down with pseudo-antique comparisons and similes. Poor Ronsard was also under obligations, at Charles the Ninth's request, to draw lessons from the lives of all the kings of France to incline one to virtue and make one hate vice. The poet never reached this part of his work, for he stopped at the end of the fourth of his projected twenty-four books, but this was what he called having on his hands the burden of four and sixty kings. The moralising tendency of the epic grew with time, until in the seventeenth century we shall find it looked upon as one of the chief characteristics of the *genre*.

Ronsard was far more successful in his eclogues. He had, it is true, the modern Humanist's misconception of pastoral poetry and looked upon it as "a dialogue between shepherds, treating, under the form of allegory, the death of princes, public calamities, mutations of states and the like." But of all poets the most sympathetic to Ronsard was the greatest writer of pastoral idyls, the Alexandrian Theocritus. Under his influence and that of his great disciple Virgil, together with the modern writers of eclogues from Petrarch to Sannazaro, Ronsard wrote poems to which great injustice has been done by modern critics. Here we find some of his best work and passages which may well be placed beside his lighter odes. Here we find the same pleasure in nature which made him appreciate its sights and sounds and seize the apt though literary epithet. If we can forget the "allegory of princes" and the characters who masquerade under the names of Orléantin, Guisin or Margot, and read for the beauty of the verse, we are sure to be rewarded. The eclogues of Baïf and the *Bergeries* of Belleau are also among the best of their compositions.

Another literary phase of the Pléiade deserves mention, though it usually does not stand by itself, because in it both Ronsard and Du Bellay wrote some of their best lines. In the *Discours des misères de ces temps* Ronsard rises to a noble strain of rhetorical satire. He was a true patriot, sincere in his Catholic convictions, and the vision of his country rent by internecine strife drew from him remonstrance and dignified lament. Du Bellay also was a satirist in the modern sense, as we shall find satire in French Classicism. It has not the brutality of the mediæval satire or the incoherence of the *coq-à-l'âne* and is influenced by Ariosto and Berni. In the *Poète courtisan*, supposed to be directed against Saint-Gelais, and in many passages of the *Regrets* we come upon elements of true Classical satire. Indeed, the *Regrets*, without losing restraint, have a fierceness of invective against the vices of Rome which make the satire all the more potent. In the Italian poems of Du Bellay there is a peculiar contrast between the hostility against a modern decadent civilisation and of melancholy which results from brooding among the ruins of a past greatness. In this enjoyment of sadness among the remains of what has been great but is now brought low, and in his lyric touch, De Bellay shows himself one of the truest Romanticists before the days of Romanticism.

Ronsard's *Hymns* were much admired during his lifetime. They are of various kinds and contain lyric, epic and didactic elements.

Next to the seven poets grouped under the name of the Pléiade, Olivier de Magny (1530–1561) deserves the highest place, and he even far excels men like Dorat or Thyard. His Italian sonnets corroborate the satire of Du Bellay, and his adaptations from Horace have all the grace of successful assimilation.[1]

The downfall of the Pléiade is seen in the writings of Philippe Desportes (1542–1606), known as the leader of what is called

[1] To these poets may be added Jacques Tahureau (1527–1555) and Ronsard's page and protégé Amadis Jamyn (1538 or 40–1592 or 93).

the second *volée* of the movement. With the decline of the Hellenism of Ronsard Italianism became rampant and Desportes is its chief example. The inspiration was no longer Pindar but Petrarch, or much rather the poor imitators of Petrarch. Desportes plagiarised unblushingly second-rate Italian poets unread today, like Pamphilo Sasso, Tebaldeo, Berardino Rota, Angelo di Costanzo, Luigi Tansillo, and in his sonnet lyrics shows the most culpable sins against good taste. In his highest inspiration he scarcely finds a greater model than Ariosto. His most voluminous collections were his love poems to Diane, Cléonice and Hippolyte. Here become rampant all the defects usually grouped under the name of Petrarchism, and as a salvation from such vices of style the advent of Malherbe was justified and welcome. Desportes cultivated, as well as the sonnet, the *stances*, which among the Italian poets were then supplanting the sonnet.

Desportes is, however, not entirely without merit: his *Bergeries* have graceful touches, and his villanelle to Rosette deserves a place in every anthology of the best trifling verse. He was a favorite among the English poets who drew from the French, and Daniel owed to him his famous sonnet, "Care-charmer Sleep, son of the sable Night."

CHAPTER VIII

THE NEW PHILOSOPHY AND THE NEW HUMANISM

NO period of French thought is more significant than the sixteenth century. Most historians, it is true, begin with Descartes, and fail to see in the previous age anything but a series of disconnected thinkers, more important in other divisions of literature than in abstract thought. It is strange that histories of philosophy more recent than Brucker and Buhle give little if any space to a name as important as that of Ramus, who stands for the Rationalism of the sixteenth century and has his claim to honor as well as Descartes.

A survey of the whole period leads one to say that the main feature of the new philosophy is the growth of Rationalism, taking rather the form of Platonism. In ethics the predominant manifestation is a stoical one.

The Reason of the Middle Ages had not stood for much and had been a mere allegorical figure. By the sixteenth century the spirit of Rationalism, which is prominent in any age of learning, and which we see linked with the older Humanism of the twelfth century, again lifts its head. The recrudescence of the sense of human dignity, which went with the growing knowledge of antiquity, promoted the feeling of independence of the intellect face to face with the tyranny of external authority. In the first half of the century the liberty of reasoning is paramount and, by shifting the standard or test of judgment, it results in the modification of nearly all the divisions of intellectual life. In history and political science the way is opened for the natural interpretation of motives and causes. The fictions which had gone with previous historical study now disappear. Moreover,

greater familiarity with the thought of the Greeks and Romans acted as a liberating tendency in the new conceptions of political theory. Thus, in the second half of the century, we can account, not only for the new historical method of Pasquier replacing in the *Recherches de la France* the ludicrous traditions of Lemaire de Belges, but for the rise of Rationalism in politics, as shown by the writings of Hotman (*Franco-Gallia*, 1573); in law, as shown by the influence of Cujas; even the revival of ideas of political liberty expressed in the *Contr'un* of La Boétie. Indeed, should we pass from the historical to the other sciences, we might by similar means explain the character of the writings and investigations of men like Ambroise Paré (1516? – 1590) the surgeon, and Bernard Palissy (1510–1589) the ceramist, though these last two were not technical Humanists or students of Greek and Latin.

In religion there arose a tendency to submit all to the conscience and substitute new standards of authority. The substitute was as dogmatically imposed as what it replaced, and the *ipse dixit* of Calvin was as uncompromising as that which was rejected. Yet it was the effort of reason, and in other countries than France the new thought took varied forms.

In ethics the same tendency prevailed to subject the question of duty or obligation to the conscience and to make morals part company from the ancient allies. As the question of duty could be considered independently from matters of faith, and as ancient philosophy gave students systems as inspiring as anything to be found in Christianity, it is not remarkable that the secularisation of morality in the sixteenth century shows wide divergences and a liberty in strong contrast with the one religious morality of Calvinism. This secularisation of morals reaches its closest approach to a lay sermon in the Humanistic tragedy of the Pléiade.[1] In the lyric poets the feeling found vent in the mitigated epicureanism already studied. In

[1] Among the lay moralists one might also mention Guy du Faur de Pibrac (1529–1584) and his versified moral quatrains.

others the chaos of beliefs begets confusion worse confounded, and the epicurean tinges his morality with metaphysical scepticism, as in the case of Montaigne. Finally, and this seems to be the most marked feature of the century, the system which had the greatest success was itself a kind of secular religion, a stoic theory based on Plutarch and Seneca, which presupposed a universal reason with immutable laws. Thus we find a new objective dogma only a few generations after the revolt against the old religious one. By this time, too, the Catholic reaction has begun, directly opposed in spirit to independence of reasoning, and the development of the order of the Jesuits is an effort to obtain possession of this secular religion and twist it to other uses. In this way we can understand the fossilisation of the spirit of rationalism and see how free reasoning becomes the automaton "Reason" of many seventeenth-century writers.

In the days of the Pléiade a corresponding philosophical manifestation, which indeed antedates the Pléiade, is found in the revolt of Ramus against Aristotelianism.

Pierre de la Ramée or Ramus (1515–1572) early took a dislike to the Aristotelian logic taught in the university, and the study of Plato made the dislike more acute. He resolved to free himself by the Socratic method, and in 1536, at his examination for the Master's degree, he enunciated the bold thesis that Aristotle's writings were all spurious and all wrong. In 1543 Ramus published two important works, the *Dialecticae partitiones* and the *Aristotelicae animadversiones*. The former was a brief treatise on logic, the latter a virulent attack on the Aristotelian method. As a result Ramus was condemned as guilty of falsehood and slander. This did not prevent the success of his work on logic, afterwards definitely issued as the *Dialecticae institutiones*. Ramus held positions of honor in the university and was royal reader in eloquence and philosophy. For a number of years he taught grammar, rhetoric and dialectic, and advocated new ideas, some profitable and some not, such as the distinction of the *lettres ramistes* (u and v, i and j), and took part in

the great dispute of the pronunciations, *kiskis* and *kankam* versus *quisquis* and *quanquam*. Ramus's attacks on Aristotle estranged him from the Church and made him a Reformer; his independence of thought won him many enemies, among them Jacques Charpentier, who caused his murder at the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew. Ramus's reputation is fourfold: he was a mathematician, a Humanist, a philosopher and a theologian. He represents the mathematical side in the two chief currents of Renaissance philosophy, the other being experimental, but both remaining until the following century, like their predecessors, a qualitative search for essences, rather than quantitative investigation, so that this anti-Aristotelian has still something of Aristotle. As a Humanist he belongs to the new class of men who believe in the dignity of French, and endeavor to make it a fit vehicle for the expression of the liberal arts; hence his *Grammar* and the French edition of the *Dialectic*.

In his philosophy Ramus appeals from authority to reason, and seeks a new method: "Nulla auctoritas rationis, sed ratio auctoritatis regina dominaque esse debet." He had in mind a Renaissance of all individual sciences, a reconstruction of every sphere of mental activity, a substitution for all past hypotheses and beliefs, whether in small matters such as grammar or great things such as theology, of new results reached by a clearer and more accurate method. The tool employed was his *Dialectic*, a Humanist's logic which had the greatest vogue in Europe, and became in England the logic of the Cambridge Platonists, as opposed to the Aristotelianism which continued to prevail at Oxford.

In his *Dialectic* Ramus proceeds largely by dichotomy, and his doctrine may be tabulated with great accuracy.* As a preface to the affirmative or dogmatic exposition he sweeps away, in his polemical writings, the defective methods of the past, from that of Aristotle to his Scholastic followers. Moreover, Aristotle was not the inventor of logic, since the faculty of thought is inherent in man.

Positive dialectic is the art of thought or reasoning, *ars disserendi*. It is based upon the assumption of three factors: nature, art and practice. Nature supplies the reasoning faculty, which, after it has given the precepts going to make up art, affords means to those who practise the arts of winning greater knowledge of itself and familiarity with its processes.

Dialectic itself has two parts: invention (*inventio*) and judgment (*judicium* or *dispositio*). The former furnishes the arguments, the latter shows what to do with them. A judgment may be axiomatic or dianoetic. In the former case it is the statement of a proposition (*enunciatum, enunciatio, pronunciatum, pronunciatio, effatum*). In the latter case it presents the drawing of one proposition from another by the syllogism, or attainment of a conclusion (*complexio* or *conclusio*) from a major (*propositio*) by means of a minor (*assumptio*), and leads up to Method.

The importance to us of the *Dialectic* of Ramus lies in the fact that Nature is to him not so much the nature which the modern man of science analyses with his implements; it is rather nature as it appears in the works of the writers of antiquity. All his examples are drawn from them, his exposition of the processes of reasoning is based on their reasoning, his desire is to win the same victories of persuasion which were won by the poets and rhetoricians of the past. This is the significance of Ramus as the philosopher of the sixteenth century. On the one hand, he preaches the rational investigation of nature and sets forth the method by which this investigation may be made. Thereby he proclaims the freedom of the reason and, for the first time, furnishes an orderly progress or *gradus* by which reason can advance to a fuller knowledge of nature. On the other hand, this nature is a limited one: it is the antiquity upon which the new literature was based. The various logical examples are literary instances drawn from the poets and orators, the modes of the syllogism are constructed from the methods of reasoning of Cicero or Ovid, and the ways of thought of the ancient authors thus take the place

of the universal processes of reasoning, with which, indeed, Ramus seems to make them coincide. It is the philosophical form of the movement which breaks with the Middle Ages, as Ramus broke loose from Aristotle, giving freedom to human reason and proclaiming the ancients as the true models for imitation. This is precisely his underlying thought when he undertakes to draw from their writings their means of argument and exposition in order to give them vogue.[1]

Meanwhile, though the members of the Pléiade import the spirit of Humanism into literature, the technical Humanist does not disappear. Henri Estienne, though he criticises the Pléiade, is none the less a representative in scholarship of its tendencies and his aims are in many respects the same. He is also one of the most prominent of a new class of writers, comprising Amyot and Pasquier, who in contrast with the older Humanists like Budé now advocate the use of French.

Not all the friends of the Pléiade write in French. Besides Dorat there are pedagogues like Marc-Antoine de Muret, for a time an intimate friend of Ronsard and Du Bellay, and sometimes included in lists of the Pléiade. But almost all he did in French was to annotate the *Amours* of Ronsard. Michel de l'Hospital is another intellectual giant. He, too, favors the new learning, and the Pindarism of Ronsard reaches its climax in celebrating the qualities of the chancellor. But Michel de l'Hospital, engrossed in the cares of state, took literature, so far as he was concerned, only as a scholar's pastime and wrote his poems in a learned language. Henri Estienne, Etienne Pasquier and Jacques Amyot have a different value.

Henri Estienne (1531–1598) belonged to one of the most distinguished families in the history of scholarship. Henri Estienne I and Robert Estienne, together with many others of

[1] The early attacks of Ramus on Aristotelianism are contemporary with the philosophical Platonism of the writings of Bonaventure des Périers with their rationalism and free thought. But Des Périers died so early that it seems unnatural to place him among the new philosophers.

the same name and their connections at various times, Josse Bade, Vascosan, Casaubon, form a worthy escort to the greatest of them, Henri II. Tribute is due to Robert Estienne, the father of Henri, whose Latin *Thesaurus* was a mighty undertaking and whose Greek and Latin publications contribute to the progress of the ideals of the Pléiade.

But Henri II surpasses his kin in learning and in achievement. He was a precocious student, an omnivorous reader, a prolific writer, an unwearied publisher, an unsurpassed intellectual planner. He prepared and published a Greek dictionary, still of considerable service. He brought out a score of *editiones principes*, among which his Anacreon profoundly affected the new school. His Plato is still the basis for the page references in all text editions. He was incessantly engaged in political and religious controversy, was harassed by business difficulties and driven by the melancholy of ill health into restless wanderings over a large part of Europe. Yet he found time to make some noteworthy contributions to literature, such as the *Apologie pour Hérodote*, the *Traité de la conformité du langage français avec le grec*, the *Deux dialogues du nouveau langage français italianisé* and the *Précellence du langage français*.

The *Apologie pour Hérodote* purports to be a defence of Herodotus from the charge of gullibility, on the ground that in modern times men have done things infinitely more incredible than what the ancient historian relates. This is Estienne's pretext for the real purpose of the work, which is a violent attack on the vices of his day. His stories are, however, told with a certain gusto not to the credit of the purity of the author's thoughts.

The ideas of Estienne's other writings are precisely those of the Pléiade: the harmony between French and Greek and the superiority of French. And this in spite of the fact that Estienne often criticises the Pléiade. The *Conformité* is typical of the Hellenist's arguments. Not only is Greek the most perfect of all languages and the standard by which they must be judged, but French, as most closely approaching Greek in character

and often in derivation, is itself to be placed above other languages, more specifically Latin and Italian. The third book is the weakest but the most amusing, for in it Estienne tries to connect French words with Greek ones by fanciful etymologies and flimsy similarities. In the *Dialogues du français italianisé* French is defended against Italian. Philausone, the "lover of Italy," converses in a *lingua franca* of Italian words with French endings, and Celthophile, the "lover of France," attacks the new and perverse manners of speech for which the Italian fashions and courtiers were chiefly responsible. The *Précellence du français*, though a mere *projet*, combines the spirit of the other two and is, on the whole, more readable. Estienne still directs his arguments mainly against Italian, and plans to prove that French is more serious, more gracious, more rich.

Perhaps these ideas can be even better appreciated under the form which they assume in the writings of Etienne Pasquier (1529–1615). Henri Estienne was a scholar of the accumulative type and his writings are patchy and filled with details of philology. Pasquier was a man with a broader power of synthesis and states the same theories with more effect. He, too, was a Humanist and a broad-minded man of the Renaissance. He was one of the most distinguished lawyers in the land; like most of his fellows he dabbled in poetry ("je suis avocat le jour et poète la nuit") and in his youth had written *le Monophile*, a prose and verse composition on the fashionable topic of love; he engaged in strife with the forces of reaction in the shape of the rising order of the Jesuits; above all, he wrote the *Recherches de la France*, a work of great learning and still of striking interest, in which he not only studied the past history and institutions of France in a spirit of enlightened rationalism, but gave much valuable information concerning the literature of his time. Illustrative passages are found both in the *Recherches* and in the *Letters*, one of the first collections to be written in French, to show his belief in the nobility of the mother tongue. Pasquier made himself the master of his books instead of being their

slave. This shows itself in his investigation of old sayings and customs from the standpoint of the rationalist: he does not hesitate to reject accepted views where they seem inadequate, he does not flinch before the rehabilitation of a character condemned by history.

It is interesting to find the same tendencies towards the appreciation of French manifested by one who was himself a professional teacher of Greek. Louis Le Roy (Ludovicus Regius, 1510–1577) had been the favorite pupil of Budé, whose life he wrote. He expounded and translated Plato and Aristotle and lectured on Demosthenes. In his writings he tended to use the innovations in style of the Pléiade; and his lectures on Demosthenes were among the first to be delivered on a learned subject in French.

Jacques Amyot (1513–1593) devoted himself to the task of improving the quality of translations from the Greek. The most important were his editions of the *Lives* and the *Moral Works* of Plutarch, but he also published versions of the story of *Theagenes and Chariclea* of Heliodorus, of the pastoral of *Daphnis and Chloe* of Longus and an edition of Diodorus Siculus.

With Amyot translation enters upon a new stage, or rather occupies a position of its own. Never were translations more numerous than in the sixteenth century, yet few were either inspiring or accurate. Amyot, it is true, mistranslates and has not the accuracy of the severe scholar. But he has the notion of style, knows how to produce the best effects of art, and manages to incorporate into French the spirit of certain authors who might otherwise have remained unfamiliar to the general reader. It is superfluous to recall to English-speaking people the effect which the works of Amyot had upon our literature. In the study of French it is interesting to note how he introduced the Humanistic spirit to the general reader, and made certain works of antiquity part and parcel of the French possession. In this way a mere translator had great power in moulding thought and action, and contributed to the material and form of seven-

teenth-century Classicism. The content of the moral writings, the heroes of the biographies still known to us as "Plutarch's men," the type of lovers of Greek romance, are synthesised in the stoic hero of Corneille, the gracious lover of seventeenth-century society, fiction and tragedy. The Plutarchian conception of the classic Greek, post-Hellenic and foreign to the truth as it really was, has probably influenced modern ideas of the ancients more than anything else. For this result Amyot is largely responsible. M. Brunetière, with a literary picturesqueness of exaggeration, makes him an ultimate source of the French Revolution, which sought to revive the heroes of antiquity, to imitate them in speech and act, to copy them in thought and manner, to paint them, even, as David did, on canvas. If this be true, the same may be said of the austere Roman ideals of the American Revolution. For North's translation of Amyot made Plutarch as English as French, and was the source of much of Shakspere's knowledge of antiquity.

As for Amyot's direct influence upon his contemporaries, even men of action, we need only remember what Henry IV said of the Plutarch whom Amyot helped him to know. To him Plutarch "souriait toujours d'une fraîche nouveauté: l'aimer c'est m'aimer, il a été l'instituteur de mon bas âge; il m'a été comme ma conscience, et m'a dicté à l'oreille beaucoup de bonnes honnêtetés et maximes excellentes pour ma conduite et le gouvernement de mes affaires."

CHAPTER IX

THE DRAMA

NO good results were reached by the Pléiade in the drama, which was destined in the next century to become the best example of Classicism. The poets were here groping even more than elsewhere, and had not definitely formulated their ideal of the play. Above all, they did not understand what action is, in the modern sense, and their plays are mostly elegies. Yet these may not be judged entirely by modern standards, inasmuch as they were probably not, as least in Paris, acted in public, but were used for theatricals by amateurs in the courts of private residences or the colleges of the university. In the provinces the plays of the Humanists seem often to have been given more publicly by scholars or actors and in more equal competition with the mediæval theatre.

But in Paris, at any rate, the distinction is marked. The Pléiade desired to revive the tragedy of the ancients, but, as elsewhere, the type was modified by imitation of Latin and Italian authors. Seneca was the common model of all moderns. The chief rival of the new school was suffering from the results of the decree of 1548 which forbade the acting in Paris of sacred mysteries. But the brotherhood of the Passion still held the monopoly of the stage.

In Italy there had been at an early date symptoms in Latin of the Renaissance tragedy. There had been a Senecan play about 1314, the *Ecerinis* of Albertino Mussato. Its subject was drawn from contemporary history, the death of the tyrant of Padua, but the *Achilleis*, long attributed to Mussato, now assigned to Loschi, a century later, about 1389, has, like most

Renaissance tragedies, a subject drawn from mythology. The *Progne* of Gregorio Corraro, about 1428 or 1429, was still more Senecan.

In the fifteenth century such imitations were less numerous, but the plays themselves of Seneca became popular in reproductions, and they were learned by heart in the schools and sometimes translated. The tragedies of Sophocles and Euripides were also better known. Finally appeared the *Sophonisba* of Trissino. In 1502 Galeotto del Carreto had produced an incoherent drama on the same subject, but the tragedy of Trissino, written in 1515 and published in 1524, is the first instance of a regular tragedy in the vulgar tongue. The Sophonisba topic, drawn from Livy and Petrarch, became one of the most popular in modern literature and was employed in Italy by Alfieri, in France by Mellin de Saint-Gelais (an adaptation from Trissino), Montchrestien, Mairet, Corneille, Voltaire among others, in England by Marston, Lee and Thomson. Other early Italian plays, some of them on characters which grew as famous in literature as Sophonisba, were the *Rosmunda* and *Oreste* of Rucellai, the *Tullia* of Lodovico Martelli, the *Antigone* of Alamanni, the *Dido* of Alessandro de' Pazzi, the *Orbecche*, *Dido* and *Cleopatra* of Giraldi Cinthio, the *Dido* of Lodovico Dolce. Of all these poets Trissino was the nearest to the Greek, Cinthio did the most to promote the blood and thunder of Seneca.

The French Humanists, as usual, asked how the Italians had solved their problems. Under foreign influences they transformed the private theatricals which they had been in the habit of giving in Latin. The acting of such plays had always been a pastime or pedagogical exercise in the universities. The most notable writer in the days immediately preceding the new movement was Ravisius Textor (c. 1470–1524), teacher at the Collège de Navarre and rector of the university at the beginning of the century. He composed a number of short Latin plays, in which Mors and Morbus are frequent characters, which may be classed as moralities, *sotties* and farces. About 1530 the

spirit of Humanism making itself more felt, the plays inclined to classical models, and were opposed to the old productions influenced by the Sorbonne. Such was the *Christus Xylonicus*, a "tragoedia" of Barthélemy de Loches (1537).

But the most important name is that of the Scottish Humanist George Buchanan (1506–1582). This great writer and scholar spent much time in France as a teacher and did his best to turn attention to the ancients and their plays, as he says "ut earum actione juventutem ab allegoriis, quibus tum Gallia vehementer se oblectabat, ad imitationem veterum, qua posset retraheret." He wrote four plays, two translations from Euripides, the *Medea* and the *Alcestis*, and two original ones, the *Baptistes* and the *Jephthes*. These plays, classical and regular in form and structure, may be considered, though written in Latin by a foreigner, as models for the early tragedy in France. Marc-Antoine de Muret wrote a Latin *Caesar* which had great vogue among scholars, and Montaigne tells us how, during his school-days, he acted successfully at Bordeaux in the plays of Buchanan and Muret. Meanwhile the Greek tragedies had become more widely known by translations into French like those of Lazare de Baïf.

The conception of tragedy was long thought to be based, even to matters of detail, upon Aristotle. It is obvious, however, upon consulting the *Poetics*, that the modern Humanistic tragedy is very different and is much narrower. The rules of tragedy, and they are rules instead of observations as in Aristotle, come, not at first hand from Aristotle, but from the study of Seneca and of the mediæval grammarians who wrote upon tragedy. In Italy people imitated the processes of Seneca. Then, as Aristotle became known, they tried to harmonise the two, and the theorists read their rules into Aristotle from the experience of Seneca. To a certain extent theory followed the practice of the modern plays, but there was plenty of material for the formulation of rules in the writings of Horace, of the grammarians Donatus and Diomed, and of Vitruvius, as these

had been handed down through the Middle Ages. These rules were then taken as law by the authors of tragedies in Italy and France.

The theory of the three unities does not appear in Aristotle. The only unity mentioned in the *Poetics* is that of action, and in practice the Greek tragedies did not observe the other unities. Aristotle did feel that, as opposed to the epic, the action of the drama should be concise and concentrated. His only hint of a unity of time is a chance observation that a tragedy tries to confine itself to one revolution of the sun or to exceed that limit but little: *ὅτι μάλιστα πειρᾶται ὑπὸ μίαν περίοδον ἡλίου εἶναι ἢ μικρὸν ἐξαλλάττειν.* This word *πειρᾶται* was made rigid law instead of being the registration of a tendency, and by the seventeenth century it was translated in France as "doit." The meaning of "a revolution of the sun" also acquired varied and surprising interpretations. Of the unity of place there is no mention in Aristotle, though gradually the unity of action was made to follow from those of time and place, instead of being the only one of importance.

The real pattern for the moderns was Seneca and his turgid, bombastic, bloodthirsty plays, typical in spirit of the fierce days of the Empire to which they belonged; permeated with a sententiousness which was to become an essential part of tragedy. So Ronsard says: "La tragédie est du tout didascalique et enseignante." Seneca probably did not know the *Poetics* of Aristotle, yet the tendency of these tragedies, or declamatory study plays, is to fall into a vagueness and indeterminateness of time and locality in harmony with the tendencies towards simplicity which Horace desires.

The theories are, then, based on the Senecan practice, to which is added an attempted conciliation with Aristotle. Even Julius Cæsar Scaliger, whose *Poetics*, published at Lyons in 1561, have been looked upon as the source of French Classical theory, or the connecting point between it and Aristotle, depends on the tradition of Seneca, and we find in literature before his

time the contents of his famous definition. This is, after all, as good a summing up as we can find of the essentials of a Classical tragedy: "Imitatio per actionem illustris fortunae, exitu infelici, oratione gravi, metrica." Scaliger's main significance is in the emphasis he gives to the *verisimile*. The theory of *vraisemblance* becomes an important part of the discussions of Chapelain, Corneille and the abbé d'Aubignac.

The whole content of the above Scaligerian definition of tragedy is found in the post-classic period and the Middle Ages. A tragedy imitates some serious action dealing with kings and princes (*illustris fortuna*); it begins cheerfully and ends sadly (*exitus infelix*), whereas the procedure of comedy is the opposite; the style of tragedy must be noble (*oratio gravis*), whereas that of comedy is light and ordinary. Moreover, Scaliger's statement of the content of tragedy is thoroughly Senecan: "Res tragicae grandes, atroces, jussa regum, caedes, desperationes, suspendia, exilia, orbitates, parricidia, incestus, incendia, pugnae, occaecationes, fletus, ululatus, conquaestiones, funera, epitaphia, epicedia."

Other tendencies are even more obviously inherited from the Latin and mediæval tradition. The moralising sententiousness is found throughout the abundant literary material influenced by the *Disticha Catonis*, of which Christine de Pisan and Alain Chartier were but two of many purveyors. The dream *motif*, found in so many Italian and French tragedies down to *Polyeucte* and *Athalie*, was one of Seneca's ways of simplifying the exposition, and is frequently found in all literature after the *Somnium Scipionis*, in the romances of chivalry, the *Roman de la Rose*, the *Quadrilogue invectif* of Chartier, the amusing parodies of serious romance in the *Roman de Renart*.

On the whole, Seneca did much to make Italian and French tragedy unnatural. He taught it declamation, but he did, however, lead it to his own models, the Greeks.

So far as the unities in modern times are concerned, the first author to deal with the question was probably Trissino.

Other Italians who discussed these matters were Giraldi Cinthio, Minturno, Robortello and Castelvetro. It was reserved for Jean de la Taille (1533–1630) to make the statement for the first time in France in 1572 in the preface of his *Saül:* "Il faut toujours représenter l'histoire ou le jeu en un même jour, en un même temps et en un même lieu." Afterwards the unities received attacks from different authors and had quite fallen into disuse, when they were revived in theory and practice by Chapelain and Mairet in the seventeenth century.

The plays themselves of the French Humanists are, almost without exception, beneath contempt. In 1552 the first French tragedy, Jodelle's *Cléopâtre*, was acted by amateurs who included Belleau. The play consists of a series of elegiac tirades with hardly any action. The same author wrote a *Didon se sacrifiant* even inferior in style to the other. Jean Bastier de la Péruse (1529–1554) wrote a *Médée* imitated from Seneca and revised by friends. Jacques Grevin's (1538–1570) *Mort de César* was based on Muret's Latin play. Florent Chrestien (1540–1596) adapted the *Jephthes* of Buchanan. Jean de la Taille was the author of two Biblical tragedies, *Saül le furieux* (cf. Seneca's *Hercules furens*) and *la Famine, ou les Gabaonites*. His young brother Jacques de la Taille (d. 1562) was ridiculed for certain eccentricities of style in his *Daire* and for his *Alexandre*. The best writer of plays in the century was Robert Garnier, and next to him came Antoine de Montchrestien at the threshold of the seventeenth.

Robert Garnier (c.1545–c.1600) wrote a number of plays of the composite character, made up of elements drawn from various ancient models, and sometimes constituting parallel plots or separate actions, in which the characters do not meet, and having practically independent endings. The language, though sometimes falling into tawdriness of expression and overfulness of monologue or recital, is not without charm, even if a borrowed one. Judging from the titles of Garnier's plays, we are apt to think he drew largely from the Greek. But the

reaction against pure Hellenism was already setting in, and Garnier's Greek elements are often from Seneca. Seneca, and to a minor degree Euripides, followed in turn by late poets and historians as Lucan, Statius, Appian and Dion Cassius, such are Garnier's guides for plot. For thought and character the spirit of Plutarch pervades the whole.

To the modern reader Garnier seems at his best in two plays which depart from his favorite mythology and ancient history. *Les Juives*, though still somewhat Senecan in treatment, is a Biblical drama on the misdeeds of the kings of Judah; *Bradamante*, drawn from Ariosto, is a romantic love-play with a happy ending, and one of the first of the tragi-comedies which will be so numerous in the next generation. But Garnier's contemporaries admired quite as much his other works, the tragedies *Porcie*, *Hippolyte*, *Cornélie*, *Marc-Antoine*, *la Troade*, *Antigone*. He not only gave hints to the great French dramatists of the seventeenth century, but he was the favorite of the group of English poets who clung to the favor and inspiration of the Countess of Pembroke and brought over some of the spirit and method of the French Humanistic drama.

Antoine de Montchrestien (c.1575–1621) was a Norman adventurer, whose wanderings took him as far as Scotland, and was killed in a religious brawl between Catholics and Huguenots. He wrote the first work to bear the title of "Political Economy" and half a dozen plays. *La Cartaginoise* was a Sophonisba tragedy; *Aman* was afterwards used by Racine when he wrote his *Esther* on the same subject; *l'Ecossaise* was a contemporary drama on the fate of Mary, Queen of Scots. The others were *les Lacènes*, *David* and *Hector*. Montchrestien's plays are lyric and declamatory in character, and his language is smoother and more polished, even if less vigorous, than that of Garnier.

The history of comedy in the second half of the sixteenth century is perhaps more complicated than the results justify. It is often difficult to determine which formative influences predominate in given plays, and yet the comedies themselves

are neither numerous nor meritorious. The reasons are obvious: The comic element is more closely linked with the popular spirit and, in its undifferentiated form, is somewhat similar in all lands. The boastful soldier of modern comedy is not necessarily the descendant of his Latin prototype, as the *Franc-Archer de Bagnolet* shows, and our contemporary plots based on the *ménage à trois* are not solely due to the fact that mediæval farces and *fabliaux* were fond of showing the husband deceived by his wife and the village priest. The task of differentiation is, then, more difficult than where, as in tragedy, we trace the genealogy of a mythological episode like the story of Antigone or note the recrudescence of an historical subject like Sophonisba.

Therefore, the theories are unfair which make sixteenth-century comedies entirely Humanistic, that is classical, or entirely Italian, or entirely mediæval French in their origins. All elements undoubtedly combine, whatever the leanings in certain cases. This may be more safely said of comedy than of any other *genre*. Thus, the first comedy of the Pléiade, Jodelle's *Eugène*, may be constructed on learned lines by a Humanist, but its subject was an old and familiar one before the imitation of Greece and of Rome became fashionable.

The new school did, indeed, begin in the usual way by translations, and we read among other instances of Ronsard's translation of the *Plutus* of Aristophanes while he was a student under Dorat. But such early works are insignificant compared with the acting of Jodelle's *Eugène* in 1552 along with his *Cléopâtre*. This comedy, regular in its five acts and division into scenes, and different from the old plays in its attempt to portray character, tells the story of the idle and corrupt ecclesiastic Eugène and his intrigues with women.

Soon after, Jacques Grévin gave his *Trésorière*, probably a development of one known as the *Maubertine*, and his *Ebahis*. The former shows how the wife of a *trésorier* or tax-collector miscalculates in her love-intrigues and is discovered. The latter describes the dotard amours of Josse, an old merchant,

the title coming from a scene of recognition or ἀναγνώρισις at the end of which the knots of the plot are cut and all remain "ébahis." It is evident that, in spite of Italian tendencies, in which Grévin is a pioneer, in the person of Panthaleone the author has done his best to make fun of Italians and of Frenchmen Italianate.

Jodelle and Grévin attack in their prologues the mediæval theatre and frankly proclaim themselves partisans of the new tendencies. Moreover, Grévin enunciates as his definition of comedy: "Un discours fabuleux, mais approchant de vérité, contenant en soi diverses manières de vivre entre les citadins de moyen état." Its purpose is to teach what is good and what is to be avoided in life, through seeing the good and the bad fortune of others.

Meanwhile the influence of Italy and the mistaken worship of the school of Ariosto increased in the comic theatre. Plays were soon translated or imitated mainly from Italian models. Jean de la Taille, besides translating his *Négromant* from Ariosto, wrote the *Corrivaux*, the first prose comedy of the new fashion, which he proclaimed to be in imitation not only of the ancient Greeks and Latins, but also of recent Italian writers. His acknowledgment of this indebtedness is a novelty. Somewhat later, after Belleau's death, was published his *Reconnue*, influenced not only by Plautus, but also by incidents and characters drawn from Italy.

Baïf turned in the direction of the classics. His *Brave* is an adaptation of the *Miles gloriosus*, his *Eunuque* a version of the play of Terence. The comedies are modernised and the names and places are changed, but the *Eunuque* keeps more closely to the original. Other writers of miscellaneous comedies are François d'Amboise, François Perrin and Jean Godard. Odet de Turnèbe's *Contents* is about the best because of its quicker movement and character drawing.

But the most famous writer of all is Pierre Larivey (1535 or 40–c. 1611), a priest and scholar of Troyes of Italian origin.

He came from the family of Italian publishers the Giunti, of whose name his is a French rendering, and he published a number of comedies in prose, all imitated from the Italian, and the majority from works published by the house of the Giunti. Nine remain, published at two dates: in 1579 *Le Laquais, la Veuve, les Esprits, le Morfondu, les Jaloux, les Ecoliers;* in 1611 *Constance, le Fidèle, les Tromperies.* Each one is a close adaptation from its model, with such modifications as were necessary to make them more natural to French readers (for in all probability they were not acted), and to justify a canon of the church for indulging in the secular pastime of comedy-writing. Larivey wrote with more snap than his contemporaries, although his pedants are as overdrawn and tedious as their predecessors or their successors, until Molière transforms them into amusing physicians. Indeed, the worth of Larivey may be judged from the fact that from him Molière did borrow many hints and make even close imitations.

Such were the tendencies of comedy, the poorest manifestation of the Pléiade and its followers. Hellenism is practically non-existent. The other elements, Latin, Italian and French, do not rise above the commonplace. There is certainly no classic restraint here: monologues over a page long are not uncommon; in *le Fidèle* there is one of nearly five pages. Epithets and tirades such as the following from *Eugène* are frequent:

A a, faux amour trop incertain!
A a, fausse et trop fausse putain!
A a, traître abbé, abbé méchant!
Moine punais, ladre, marchant
De tes refrippés bénéfices!
A a, puant sac tout plein de vices,
M'as-tu osé faire ce tort?

There is little effective character-drawing. We expect types, but there is not much to distinguish between the various dotards, intriguing women, valets, parasites, pedants and swashbucklers. Again, the stock episodes of Italian comedy are constantly

repeated as well as types: girls disguised as boys, lovers' ruses, servants' devices. Many of these are found, it is true, in Molière, but are there displayed with art.

We may, however, say this in favor of the comedies of the sixteenth century: in these plays, many of them unacted, the authors did at least mould an external form to be used for later contents. The division into acts and scenes is introduced, the plot is usually raised in dignity from the peasantry of the old farce to the *bourgeoisie*, good models are sought in Plautus, Terence, and Ariosto, the plays give interesting pictures of the manners and morals of the age. Finally, an attempt was made to evolve a theory of comedy.

CHAPTER X

REFORMERS AND HUGUENOTS

A HISTORY of the non-Catholic literature shows great power and promise but comparatively little achievement, on account of the course taken by politics and national history. Almost without exception the Protestant writers were men of the greatest vigor and originality, of the most marked strength of expression. The Hebraic inspiration of many of them was capable of supplying France with new and rich material, had not the victory of Catholicism confined literature to the Latin tradition. Calvin is today looked upon by most historians of French literature as a great writer, but an isolated one without marked influence upon national thought. Had the Huguenots been victorious in the struggle he, rather than Bossuet, would have marked the standard of rhetoric.

The early Reformation is closely linked with Humanism, and the Reformers, almost without exception, were learned men. The earliest of them helped to disentangle Aristotle from the cobwebs of Scholasticism. This was Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples (d. 1536), or Faber Stapulensis, *homuncio* or *homunculus* as his contemporaries called him, "un petit bout d'homme" says Bayle, but a far greater man than his stature implied. Early in life he had travelled in Italy and had also steeped himself in Hellenism; then, turning to Biblical work and even in a way forestalling Luther, in 1509 he brought out his *Quincuplex Psalterium*. His Latin commentaries of three years later on the *Epistles* of St. Paul may be looked upon as the first Protestant work in France and the expression of so-called Fabrisian Protestantism, from the author's name Lefèvre or Fabri. In this

book he turned to the original word of Christ and the apostolic doctrine, and taught justification by faith. To him the sacraments had no magic power, and he attacked the celibacy of the priests, the liturgy, and fasts of the Catholic religion, but without assailing the constitution of the Church. Lefèvre later translated into French the Gospels and then the whole Bible (1530). His teachings merged into those of Luther or were swept away by them, but he had a strong influence by arousing followers in France and Germany. Thus, he was a friend of Marguerite de Navarre, who went as near the dividing line between the two faiths as is possible, and was the master of Briçonnet, the leader of the religious movement of Meaux, and of Guillaume Farel. Briçonnet's courage was not equal to his convictions, and the vague mysticism of Meaux had no effect except on the incoherence of Marguerite de Navarre. Guillaume Farel (1489–1565), on the other hand, was a militant leader, though his writings were insignificant and his teachings mainly verbal, and he became the founder of Protestantism in Switzerland.

Pierre Viret (1511–1571) took up the work with Farel and, by his teaching and writings, he paved the way for the despotism of Calvin at Geneva. Meanwhile the turmoil of religious unrest was surging in France and involving, or soon to involve, Marguerite and Marot, and to bring about the execution of Berquin. Noël Béda and Pierre Lizet, narrow-minded in spite of their learning, represented the forces of reaction, the Sorbonne and the Parlement. The desire to popularise the Scriptures passed from Lefèvre to one who deserves mention for his own sake, besides being the kinsman of Calvin, Pierre Robert or Olivetanus (d. 1538), the burner of midnight oil, *oleum*. He, too, translated the Bible and initiated his youthful relative to new ideas.

Jean Cauvin or Calvinus, Gallicised back into Calvin (1509–1564), was a Picard of a fairly good family and destined by his father for the Church. He was tonsured and received preferment at a precocious age, but was never a full priest. He studied

in Paris, leaving the Collège de Montaigu in 1528, the very year in which Loyola took up his residence there, and then, by his father's desire, began the study of law at Orléans and Bourges, though his interest in theology remained unabated and was fostered by the great Lutheran Melchior Wolmar, who also taught him Greek. Returning to Paris, he was implicated in the sensational affair of the address made by his friend, the rector Nicolas Cop, in 1533 before the university. This discourse was heretical and was recognised to be inspired by Calvin himself, so that both men had to flee from the city. After various wanderings Calvin reached Bâle, where in 1536 appeared the Latin version of his great Protestant work, the *Christianae religionis institutio*. This was accompanied by an important preface addressed to Francis I. A later edition was the basis of Calvin's own first translation into French in 1541.

Calvin afterwards travelled in Italy, where Renée de France, duchess of Ferrara, came under his influence. Then, passing through Geneva, he was called on by Farel to help in the organisation of the new religion. In 1538 their violence caused the banishment of both, but a couple of years later Calvin was recalled, and from then until his death, he ruled the city of Geneva with a despotic control, crushing the liberty of thought and action of all who opposed his views. Calvin and his party organised a theocratic government based on his interpretation of the traditions of the primitive Church, and destroyed with unsparing hand all who stood in his way. Calvin, like so many Frenchmen, was inherently logical, and when he put his logic into operation he was as cruel as the later logicians who caused the massacres of the French revolution. Originally of a gentle and sympathetic character, but soured by ill health and overwork, dehumanised into a logical machine, Calvin not only showed himself cruel to his opponents in his own day, as when he put to death Servetus, for holding views different from his, and persecuted Castellion, but spread over future generations of followers yet unborn the curse of his gloomy creed. His was,

nevertheless, an impulse of vigor and energy, and the Huguenots of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as well as the handful of French Protestants today, have always held an influence out of proportion to their numbers. Those who left France at the revocation of the Edict of Nantes drained the country of much of its best force. This strength of character was partly due to the redeeming quality of Calvinism, its founder's moral strain, and the emphasis laid on the conscience and duty. But these advantages were dearly bought.

As a writer Calvin combined the traditions of the Humanist and the theologian. He was a master of Latin style and most of his writings were in that language. From Maturin Cordier the Latin scholar, from Wolmar the Hellenist, he had gained a knowledge of what the classics can give. An early work of his, a commentary on the *De clementia* of Seneca, was permeated with the spirit of ancient culture.

As a French writer he takes the highest rank. Not only does he show that spirit of logic in which the Frenchman delights, but in his progressive appreciation of the needs of a change in language he keeps pace with the times. The later editions of the *Institution de la religion chrétienne*, as in 1560, are as modern in style as the earliest is archaic. This style has simplicity as against the pomp of the Latin rhetoric of the Bossuet type.

In spirit, this work of Calvin, of which all his other writings are but the elaboration and elucidation, is the glorification of God as interpreted by the word of Scripture. Face to face with the majesty of an all-powerful deity is the insignificance of man. God has, in spite of his goodness, allowed the fall of man, who has sinned by pride and disobedience, but is to be redeemed from this original sin by Jesus, through the mediation of the Holy Ghost. Yet the chosen ones among men are selected through the Grace of God; salvation is won by faith and not works, and God has condemned to eternal punishment those whom it has not pleased him to save. Such is the black Predestination of the Calvinistic theory. At the same time the reasoning of

Goethe thought him a master. Yet there has been no edition of his works published in France for three hundred years. One poet alone in France, Heredia, himself half foreign, took from an episode of Du Bartas' chief poem the title of his *Trophées*.

The writings of Du Bartas began with a brief epic poem called *Judith*, telling the story of Holophernes, in which he imitated, he said in the preface, Virgil and Homer, though he was also influenced in parts by the reading of Ariosto. This poem afterwards appeared in a collection of the "Christian Muse" with the *Triomphe de la foi* and *Uranie*, a summons to religious poetry. Late in life he wrote a poem on the battle of Ivry.

But Du Bartas's most ambitious effort was a continuation of the epic tendency begun in the *Judith*. He wrote a long poem on the creation of the world called the *Semaine*. This he planned to continue by a new one on the religious history of civilisation, in which the different epochs were to appear as days. Of this second work, which Du Bartas ambitiously intended to carry on to the Day of Judgment, only the first two days were finished, with fragments of the third and fourth.

This conception was original so far as French poetry was concerned, though it was germane to the sixteenth-century notion that a *speculum* or encyclopedia of the sciences was a fit medium for the erudite poet. It is in the mediæval bestiaries and lapidaries that one sees precursors, though not ancestors, of much of Du Bartas's erudition; closer analogies are probably to be found with a late Greek poem of the seventh century, the *Hexahemeron*, and a work of Maurice Scève less famous than the *Délie*, called the *Microcosme*. But Du Bartas's true inspiration for material is the Bible, with much besides contributed from his wide learning and treated in the epic vein now traditional.

Du Bartas's matter is then original, and he treats it in a new way, not merely with the pagan allegory of the literary moralist, but with the higher ethical and religious teaching of the Huguenot. He uses the trappings of mythology, but they are merely

verbal forms and do not lead us to the "Minerve sera la prudence et Vénus la beauté" of the seventeenth century.

If Du Bartas's material is original, and so far he is called an "independent," he is in form and language a follower, unfortunately at times a caricature, of Ronsard. His great defect is a want of restraint and ignorance of the confines of taste. In vocabulary he carried to excess the Ronsardian tendency towards the manufacture of new words by compounding, by grafting (*provignement*), by trivial reduplications ("ba-battre," "flo-flotter"), by using Hellenic constructions of grammar. He is often muddled and inelegant in his metaphors and similes, as when he calls the sun the "grand duc des chandelles." Above all, he has been scoffed at for a tendency which the greatest poets have not sought to avoid, the imitation in his verse of sounds. Such is the famous description of the lark:

> La gentille alouette avec son tire-lire,
> Tire lire à l'iré, et tire-lirant tire
> Vers la voûte du ciel: puis son vol vers ce lieu
> Vire et désire dire: "Adieu, Dieu; adieu, Dieu."

This is but the "Brekekekkex-coax-coax" of Aristophanes or the "To whit, to whoo" of Shakspere, or the "Pour qui sont ces serpents qui sifflent sur nos têtes?" of Racine. Or, again, his imitation of cannon,

> Et leur ton ton-tonnant erre et prompt rond le rond
> Du plancher étoilé,

is no worse than the Homeric description of the jolt of laden mules:

> Πολλὰ δ' ἄναντα κάταντα πάραντά τε δόχμιά τ' ἦλθον.

Du Bartas had many a defect. He should at least receive greater credit than the French have allowed him for what he accomplished in the epic vein.

Théodore Agrippa d'Aubigné (1552–1630), another Gascon Huguenot, has had a happier posthumous fame. Though

most of his works did not appear until well into the seventeenth century, yet they were in his mind or actually composed earlier, and are in every way representative of the sixteenth century to which they belong.

Agrippa d'Aubigné was a Southerner of the proverbial type, exuberant and boisterous in disposition, quick to take offence and rich in enemies, so that he was several times condemned to death, but a faithful friend to those he loved, like Henry IV. The latter's fickleness and apostasy of the Protestant cause he viewed with anguish and scorn, but he was his trusty lieutenant through years of fighting during the civil wars. He had been a precocious child and by his own account knew Latin, Greek and Hebrew at six, and translated the *Crito* of Plato at seven. We know that he was active mentally as a lyric and epic poet, a historian, a political and religious controversialist.

Though d'Aubigné's title to fame rests today chiefly on his *Tragiques*, a remarkable combination of religious epic and satire, he began as a simple follower of Ronsard and composed graceful little poems, with occasionally a really charming line in the prevailing moods of lyric song and with touches of his vigorous personality.

The *Tragiques* reproduce, on the other hand, with fierceness and bitter invective, the oratorical strain of Ronsard's satire. But this is united with political philippic, lyrical and descriptive episodes. The result, with its bitter iambic mood and the vehemence of a Hugo writing the *Châtiments*, merits by its Biblical and Hebraic inspiration to be called the outline of a Huguenot epic. The epic tone is not sustained throughout, but it is as deserving of that name as anything which French literature has produced since the Middle Ages. The poem was begun early and was on the stocks for much of the author's life, so that its final form may have been slightly modified by the swiftly changing national literature. It is artificially partitioned out into seven books dealing with different phases of the wars of religion and the misfortunes of France: *Misères; Princes*, on the debauch-

ery of the court; *la Chambre dorée*, on the traffic of justice; *les Feux*, on religious persecutions; *les Fers*, on civil wars; *Vengeances*, on the oppressors of faith, and *Jugement*. Sweeping through the satire and invective is a current of religious and ethical teaching coming from the Bible and the Roman Stoics of the Silver Age. D'Aubigné is not a Hellenist; he belongs to the second *volée*, to use his own expression concerning the poets of the Pléiade, but it is to the Romans and not to the Italians that he turns. Hence Seneca, Lucan, Juvenal, and Tacitus are his models, and Catherine de' Medici is the Jezabel or the Messalina of modern France.

The fondness for Tacitus shows itself in d'Aubigné's most ambitious prose work, the *Histoire universelle*, which is, however, mainly an account of the civil wars from the point of view of the Protestant. This, like the *Tragiques*, is artificial in its arrangement; for, as the author himself explains, each book ends with the end of a war and a treaty of peace or "equipollent" thing, and after the treaty comes a chapter uniting the affairs of France to those of its four neighbors, and then four chapters for the four parts of the world, "in such proportion that should one take the chapters by parallel columns" one could obtain a history of all the world. Thus history was made to fit d'Aubigné's narrative instead of his narrative history. The imitation of Tacitus is noticeable even to words and phrases, as in his summing up of Henry III, "digne du royaume s'il n'eût point régné" (*omnium consensu imperii capax nisi imperasset*). D'Aubigné was clearly the same kind of a man as Tacitus shows himself, with fierce passion, smouldering hatred, bursting into violent outbreaks, cynical, satirical, and living in a similar epoch of upheaval. He was also influenced by the stately periods of De Thou's Latin *Historia sui temporis* based on Livy.

There is much that is personal in the *Histoire universelle*. This is also seen in d'Aubigné's own memoirs or autobiography, the *Sa vie à ses enfants*, full of boasting and exaggeration, but useful as a human document. The satire appears in the political

invective of the *Confession du sieur de Sancy*, a mock self-justification of the conversion of a religious turncoat Harlay de Sancy, and in the less personal *Aventures du baron de Fæneste*, written in the last part of the author's life and giving in a queer jargon, partly of Gascon dialect, pictures of court life, of the Catholic religion, in discourses between the Gascon Fæneste (φαίνεσθαι), who cares for appearances, and the more serious Enay (εἶναι). In this style of writing d'Aubigné was influenced by his coreligionist Estienne and the *Apologie pour Hérodote*.

CHAPTER XI

MONTAIGNE

MICHEL EYQUEM DE MONTAIGNE was born in 1533 at the manor of Montaigne between Saint-Emilion and Bergerac in Périgord. His father was a well-to-do citizen of Bordeaux, a former *jurat* and mayor, who after becoming wealthy in business aspired to become the squire of Montaigne, rather than Pierre Eyquem, trader in wines and fish. His mother came from a family of Portuguese Jews named Louppes or Lopez. Pierre Eyquem was, however, a man of intellect, anxious to give his son the best education; he had also learned in Italy to love the new learning of the Renaissance. He surrounded Michel's infancy with harmonious sounds of music and lured him on to knowledge by useful games. He even taught him Latin before his mother tongue. Michel was sent to school at the flourishing Collège de Guyenne at Bordeaux, where he came under the guidance of George Buchanan, Muret, Guérente, and Grouchy and under the general influence of the principal, André Gouvéa, and of Maturin Cordier, the famous author of school colloquies. After finishing a training which, Montaigne regrets, scarcely justified by its results the trouble involved, he studied law in order to be a magistrate, served in the Cour des Aides of Périgueux and, upon its suppression, in the Parlement of Bordeaux. There he became acquainted with Etienne de la Boétie, the author of the *Discours de la Servitude volontaire* or *Contr'un*, with whom he formed his deepest friendship and whose death in 1563 he mourned as one of the griefs of his life: "Si on me presse de dire pourquoi je l'aimais, je sens que cela ne se peut exprimer qu'en répondant:

Parce que c'était lui, parce que c'était moi." Some years later Montaigne, at his father's request, translated the *Theologia naturalis*, a theological and metaphysical work based on Saint Thomas Aquinas, by Raymond de Sebonde, written in Latin diluted with Spanish expressions. In 1571, after marriage to a good wife, of whom however he has but little to say, and the death of his father, Montaigne gave up definitely an active career in the courts and withdrew to his estates to be a country squire, and to cultivate his property or, perhaps even more, his mind. He collected about him what was, in those days, a large library, selected from ancient and modern authors, historians, his particular *gibier*, writers of epistles, moralists, and poets. This library he brought together in a quiet and retired room adorned with mottoes expressing his philosophic moods, such as οὐδὲν ὁρίζω, οὐ καταλαμβάνω, ἐπέχω, σκέπτομαι. Each man, says he, must have a private *arrière-boutique*, a place of intellectual refuge from the disturbances of life. For eight or nine years he jotted down and wrote out, in the form of essays, his reflections on life or his experiences and published the results in two books in 1580. In these chapters the author's thoughts were set forth as they had occurred to him, rather as the expression of varying moods than as consistent argument or exposition.

In 1580–81 Montaigne took a long journey, partly for the sake of his health. He visited Switzerland, Germany, and Italy and described his experiences in a journal not intended for publication, discovered in the eighteenth century and printed for the first time in 1774. A portion of it is in Italian. During his absence, while at the baths of Lucca, he was chosen mayor of Bordeaux, a sign of the important position he held in public estimation, and was elected to a second term in 1583. It was during the later period that the plague broke out in the city, and Montaigne took the much criticised step of refusing to return to the stricken place on the ground that he could be of more service by keeping away. In a somewhat similar contingency,

n the following century, Rotrou stuck to his post at Dreux only :o perish from the malady.

After a trip to Paris, during which for political reasons Montaigne was imprisoned by the Ligue for the briefest period in the Bastille, he published in 1588 a new edition of his essays with six hundred interpolations, sometimes inconsistent with what had gone before, but mainly in the form of anecdotes, quotations, or personal experiences. There was also a totally new book, the third. There had been intermediate issues in 1582 and 1587 with very slight changes, and indeed, the important edition of 1588 was called the fifth, though we have no trace of a fourth.

Montaigne died of a quinsy at his country manor in 1592, but the final edition of his writings had not appeared. He had gone on annotating the text, and in 1595 his devoted admirer and *fille d'alliance*, Mlle de Gournay, published with the help of Pierre de Brach the final collection of Montaigne's essays. This is full of new illustrative matter, but a number of quotations and references which were in the 1588 edition have disappeared.

The motive of Montaigne in taking to writing may have been far more accidental than his fame suggests. Suppose a man of education and experience deliberately withdrawing from active life, but not from contact with books or from reflection upon the world. He jots down his observations in a somewhat disconnected form, as a "fagotage de pièces décousues," and illustrates his comments by his reading or his reading by his thoughts. At first these thoughts are impersonal, though Montaigne is interested in the individual elements of character and of experience: anecdotes and stories. Gradually, as he was left much to himself, the comments or essays acquired a more personal touch, Montaigne began to study himself and to register, with a not uncommon assumption of frankness, but rarely so thorough as in this case, all his fads and fancies, his qualities and defects: "C'est ici un livre de bonne foi, lecteur." Finally, it may be

confessed, Montaigne's speech reached a plainness which frightens some readers.

The essays cannot, then, be examined as a consistent whole, and any attempt to find a logical scheme is foredoomed to failure. He had an *esprit primesautier* and a desultory mind, and the latest text represents the accretions of different periods, with passages which contradict as much as they confirm other passages: "J'ajoute, mais je ne corrige pas," — though this is not strictly true. The additions have often passed from margin to text without connecting transitions, and a pronoun which in 1580 was near its antecedent noun may by 1588 or 1595 have been driven far from it by the insertion of a whole paragraph carrying the reader off on another tack.

Consistency is not to be looked for in the mental attitude of Montaigne any more than in his grammar. More than one of the essays, says Etienne Pasquier, might well be called a *coq-à-l'âne*. He was a *fureteur*, an observer without *a priori* notions or generalisations, and his views on man varied as time went on, as he read or reflected. It has been customary to read into Montaigne the opinions of later writers who have studied him for corroboration or refutation, as Pascal. Or again, the generalisations as to the views of Montaigne have frequently been made from certain passages registered by him as the expression of a passing mood. M. Strowski, one of the most recent students of Montaigne, trying to deal with his thought in the stages of its progressive development, traces a gradual transition from stoicism, through scepticism to the detached attitude of the unconcerned though interested observer known as dilettanteism. But the term dilettanteism must not be taken in too unfavorable a sense: Montaigue was not the superficial æsthete and mere hedonist. Perhaps the term "jouisseur" sometimes applied to him even generalises too strongly the epicurean side of his character. Brunetière fittingly calls him an ever inquisitive man, a "curieux," rather than a dilettante. His attitude is more that of "Suave mari magno" than one of the dweller in

the ivory tower of superciliousness. To paraphrase Sainte-Beuve's dictum on Chateaubriand, that he was "an epicurean with a Catholic imagination," Montaigne might perhaps be called an epicurean with a stoic imagination. It is, indeed, a truism that epicureanism and stoicism often merge into each other.

Montaigne's first favorites were Plutarch and Seneca, particularly the former. In the moral works of Plutarch seen through Amyot's translation, Montaigne amid the troubles of war-ravaged France seeks the tranquillity of soul and separation from unessential ties which may help him to encounter life, or the fortitude which may make him bear up under the thought of death: "Philosopher, c'est apprendre à mourir." Wife, children, wealth, and health are good, but not if they interfere with our happiness.

Later, Montaigne passes through a stage which in his case is usually characterised as pyrrhonism or philosophic doubt. He is not an unbeliever, an agnostic, so far as the Church is concerned: he follows the ceremonies of the Catholic religion and observes all its rites. But this did not go very deep: he was a Catholic as he was a native of Périgord. His study of man had brought about him a sort of disillusion and realisation of the vanity of things and the uselessness of seeking stability in judgment or conduct. Man is weak and impotent in his conclusions, he has taken upon himself a position of overlordship in nature to which he has no right to aspire, insignificant as he is and a mere phase in the flow of passing phenomena. The only sensible attitude is to stand aside without venturing upon conclusions, to seek an ataraxy or quiet of mind, to make no judgment stronger than ἐπέχω — I refrain from judging. "Que sais-je?" is the motto of Montaigne.

Finally, when he has enlarged his observation through travel and come into new contact with life in the mayoralty, the ataraxy passes into dilettanteism. However, Montaigne's study still promotes the knowledge of man, and here is to be found his chief contribution to the literature of Classicism. He was one

of the first psychologists of modern France, and the literature of the seventeenth century proclaims that the proper study of mankind is man. He recorded, as a psychological and moral observer, personal characteristics; wherein, however, the individual man is at one with the general man. The influence of Montaigne is again and again evident in such a writer as La Bruyère, and his attitude towards the problems of the world paves the way for the two greatest thinkers of the seventeenth century, Descartes and Pascal. They both, like Montaigne, are philosophers of doubt, and the writings of Pascal are permeated with sentences by Montaigne. But they both take steps in advance of Montaigne which enable them by different ways to escape from his satisfied irresolution. Montaigne's doubt is an end in itself, that of Descartes only a tool of rational criticism.

If we do try to consider Montaigne's thought a little more as a unit and pick out the most valuable and characteristic material, his most positive statements, we find in him an extraordinarily vivid instance of self-portraiture, a striking exposition of the attitude of suspended judgment, some interesting suggestions on education, which may seem hackneyed today, but were at least in France novel enough in their time. The views of Rabelais and Montaigne upon education are again and again coupled together.

"When I die," says Montaigne, "this book may help my kinsfolk and friends to keep alive their memory of me." The task has been performed for all of Montaigne's readers, who learn that he was below medium stature, stocky in build, of good health and constitution except for his sufferings from the stone, clumsy and unpractical, sluggish and easy-going, without keen ambition, forgetful and absent-minded, lacking in concentration, — the defects which Montaigne proclaims would be too many to register. His unfriendly critics have deduced from his statements other charges: selfishness, lack of family affection except for his father, vanity and conceit in parading his mind before the reader and retailing his whims, whether he prefers

white wine to red or likes to sit with his feet higher than his head.[1] Many of these details are pardonable and have, indeed, a particular interest to the numerous lovers of personal literature. In other cases one asks if Montaigne is not playing with himself and with the reader's credulity: "Je suis moi-même la matière de mon livre: ce n'est pas raison que tu emploies ton loisir en un sujet si frivole et si vain: adieu donc." Montaigne's ideal is the gentleman of culture and of position, the "country gentleman" such as the English admire. Though he is not the city man of the seventeenth century, he anticipates the "honnête homme" of that age: he is intelligent, well-mannered, averse to pedantry or the pose of erudition, rather sceptical, guided by reason and common sense. But Montaigne is a conservative and balks at novelty, whatever countenance it may assume.

The ideas of the sceptic are to be found in the *Apologie de Raymond de Sebonde*. Montaigne's memory went back to the treatise which he had translated for his father, and it now served as a peg on which to hang his views. Sceptical writers were not numerous, but they did exist in Montaigne's day. From the translation of the old writer Sextus Empiricus he certainly drew material. Raymond de Sebonde, in his *Theologia naturalis*, had argued that reason can prove religion. In the *Apologie* Montaigne undertakes to argue in Raymond's defence that it is right to support faith by human arguments, and that his arguments are as good as those brought against him. But he inconsistently wanders into a series of sceptical illustrations of his own. Montaigne attacks the opponents of Sebonde to show the importance of their reason in denying his views, and to assert the necessity of using all the arguments we can get. He tries to turn their theories against themselves by asking, if reason

[1] Somebody has applied to him the lines of Kipling:

> He is the jester and the jest
> And he himself the text applies.

does not lead to faith, whither does it lead? For reason is truly helpless, and we have no right even to doubt Christianity. Man, though so proud, is far from being the most important object in nature. In many respects man is no better than the animals. Can his efforts to attain virtue and truth be successful? The various philosophical sects produce only contradictory opinions, reason is unavailing to tell us the truth about God, the world, the soul, the body. Reason is not consistent with itself, and our own opinions vary from day to day. For the mind of man is obscured by all our passions and emotions, all the phases of our sensation, and man is a prey to appearances and the plaything of phenomena without the hope of attaining to true knowledge and the essence of things. God alone can help man if he will, and by him man will rise "abandonnant et renonçant à ses propres moyens, et se laissant hausser et soulever par les moyens purement célestes. C'est à notre foi chrétienne . . . de prétendre à cette divine et miraculeuse métamorphose."

The most famous instance of Montaigne's practical advice, though it is not the most characteristic of his essays, is the chapter on the bringing up of children, *De l'Institution des enfants*, written some time after the other, though it precedes it in the editions. His views are not original; he repeats the charges against the older education of the Humanists before his day, from Vittorino da Feltre to Vivès, Erasmus, and Rabelais. To Montaigne, more particularly, mere erudition was a secondary matter, and he wished above all to see in the individual the development of power. One ought to form, not a grammarian or a logician, but a *gentleman*. The pupil should, therefore, be taught not so much facts as the cause of facts; memory is to be cultivated less than judgment. And, finally, all the experiences of life may serve for the schooling of the boy: he is far more likely to gain profit from the uncouth language of taverns than from the artificially constructed syllogisms, whose sophistical quibbles are as likely as not to lead him astray through their fallacies.

From two such essays one can scarcely infer the miscellaneous character of Montaigne's writings. All that he has seen and read appears at unexpected moments. As a result of this desultory method Montaigne is one of the most difficult authors to read, yet he has been one of the French authors most influential abroad. Florio's translation made him known to Shakspere, who uses so many phrases reminiscent of Montaigne's thought about the undiscovered country or the sleep that rounds our little life, that some critics have maintained that Montaigne is Hamlet, and that the play is a protest against Montaigne's scepticism. This is ludicrous, but the passage in the second act of the *Tempest* on the ideal commonwealth is a mere paraphrase of one in Montaigne's essay on cannibals. Bacon's essays are influenced by him, and it is not impossible that the two authors once met. The pessimist Burton in his *Anatomy of Melancholy* is in the spirit of Montaigne, as is the optimist Sir Thomas Browne in his *Religio Medici* and the anecdotes of the *Vulgar Errors*. The megalomania of Nietzsche as well as the self-annihilation of the Frenchman Pascal have been influenced by him. Sterne's Rabelaisian moods have borrowed something too from the discursiveness of Montaigne, and the modern essayists down to Hazlitt or Emerson have felt his power. Centuries ago Ben Jonson put the matter concretely when in *Volpone*, speaking of the numerous borrowings from Guarini's *Pastor fido*, he said:

> All our English writers,
> I mean such as are happy in th' Italian,
> Will deigne to steale out of this author mainely,
> Almost as much as from Montaignie.

The reason for this popularity is not far to seek; there is a close similarity between the frankness of Montaigne and the personal spirit of many English writers; the confessions of his own character and his self-portraiture have made him, like Pepys, an interesting human document apart from questions of literary merit. To the foreigner his revelations appeal in spite of

his incoherent style; to the Frenchman the flashes of eloquence with which his pages are from time to time scattered counterbalance much that is trivial and incongruous.

The influence of Montaigne shows itself most strongly in two writers of the transitional period from the sixteenth to the seventeenth century: Guillaume du Vair (1556–1621) and Pierre Charron (1541–1603), who was somewhat older but who borrowed from the other writer.

Du Vair was a prominent prelate, high-minded magistrate and statesman during the Ligue, whose translations from the ancients and treatise on the decay of French oratory would have been creditable alone in his day, but who owes his present fame to his moral writings. He continues the line of the French Stoics, but with a sturdier and broader feeling than in Montaigne's self-centred thought, and unites with stoicism the Christian feelings of Providence, hope and resignation, and the immortality of the soul.

Charron, borrowing unblushingly from Montaigne and Du Vair, is the disciple who systematises the master's theories and pushes them to still more extreme conclusions. He, like Du Vair, was a priest and a supporter of everything orthodox in his *Traité des trois vérités*, the truth of God, the truth of Christianity, the truth of Catholicism. On the other hand the *Traité de la sagesse* is at bottom an exposition of philosophic doubt for the use, not of the man in the street who needs the prop of faith, but rather for the intellectual aristocrat whose ethics are based on the head rather than the heart. His search for tranquillity of soul brings him to a scepticism more dogmatic than that of Montaigne. It is now "Je ne sais" instead of "Que sais-je?" The moral qualities of prudence, justice, force, and temperance will be our lay guides in a world in which religion is secondary and in its manifestations often absurd and false. Carrying on the thought of Montaigne that we are Christians as we are natives of Périgord, he says: "La nation, le pays, le lieu, donne la religion; l'on est de celle que le lieu auquel on est né et élevé

tient: nous sommes circoncis, baptisés, juifs, mahométans, chrétiens, avant que nous sachions que nous sommes hommes." The effect of such teachings and the influence of this "orthodox sceptic" on the "libertins," the freethinkers, and unbelievers of the seventeenth century is obvious.

CHAPTER XII

AUTHORS OF MEMOIRS. HISTORIANS AND POLITICAL WRITERS

THE sixteenth century, which is marked by so much individualism, is rich in personal literature in the form of memoirs. It has also much historical writing which, in many cases, merges into discussion of political or economic theory. The civil wars and national contests set in motion a number of polemical works on religion, and pamphlets.

Historical narrative was, to a considerable degree, impeded by the tradition of Latin. With few exceptions, the fashion of Livy prevailed, and sonorous high-flown Latin periods were the mode of expression for the most admired writers. The Italian Paolo Emilio of Verona, at the very threshold of the century, wrote *De rebus gestis Francorum*, something like the old *Chroniques* retold in classical language. Even the most important historian of the century, Jacques-Auguste de Thou (1553–1617), wrote the *Historia sui temporis* or *Thuana*, covering the second half of the sixteenth century and published in 1604, in Latin on the model of Livy. This work was afterwards translated into French, but its original form was too deeply impressed upon it to permit it to become a living book. It was, however, to a noteworthy degree, the standard and model for historians even in French in the seventeenth century.

D'Aubigné's important *Histoire universelle*, which is spoken of elsewhere, had also another model in Tacitus. Girard du Haillan (circa 1536–1610), though as royal historiographer he wrote annals of his time much like the old chronicles, was also one of those who used French.

Vastly more interesting and more useful to the modern histo-

rian than the periods of De Thou are the numerous memoirs of the sixteenth century. Sometimes these verged on history, such as the Du Bellay memoirs. Guillaume du Bellay-Langey (1491–1543) wrote a Latin history of the reign of Francis I, the *Ogdoades*, so called because in eight books and after the plan of the decades of Livy. This he translated into French. Much of it was lost, and was replaced and filled out, after his death, in a new form by his brother Martin du Bellay. But still more valuable as literature are the writings of Monluc, La Noue, Brantôme, and Marguerite de Valois.

Blaise de Monluc (1502–1577) was a Gascon endowed with the proverbial Gascon traits of exuberance and vagabondage. His brave and dashing character made him finally rise to the position of marshal of France, after achievements such as the defence of Siena in Italy against the imperial troops and his severe wounding at the siege of Rabastens. In this last contest he was frightfully disfigured (*lou nase de Rabastens*) and obliged to resort to a mask. Monluc's memoirs are *Commentaries*, and he had those of Cæsar in mind when he wrote them. They were composed largely from memory and are therefore neither strictly impartial nor accurate, and Monluc was as harsh and cruel a fighter as ever lived. The latter pages of this "soldier's Bible," as Henry IV called it, are full of bloodshed.

François de la Noue (1531–1591), called *Bras de Fer* because of his artificial arm, a Breton by birth, was a brave Huguenot warrior who, during a period of captivity in the Spanish fortress of Limburg, wrote his *Discours politiques et militaires*. These deal with more numerous subjects than the title suggests: some are a picture of France during the civil wars, others touch on economic or social questions; some are the writings of a moralist; and the twenty-sixth and last is a personal narrative, covering the years 1562 to 1570, sometimes alluded to separately as the *Memoirs* of La Noue. He is considered one of the dignified and human figures of a cruel age.

Pierre de Bourdeilles, lay abbé de Brantôme (1540–1614),

whose home and abbey were in the vicinity of Périgueux, had spent nearly all his life in travelling over Europe or in the army and at court. He is the great gossip of the sixteenth century, who, to while away the time after a fall from horseback, wrote telltale biographies of the "*grands capitaines étrangers*," the "*grands capitaines français*," the "*dames illustres*" and the "*dames galantes*," though these names do not correspond completely to the ones which Brantôme chose. He also wrote some other minor works.

Brantôme was not a professional man of letters, but he had the gift of the picturesque, and consequently his narratives and descriptions, though eminently unreal and profoundly biassed either favorably or unfavorably, afford a mine of information, often of tittle-tattle and slander concerning his times. It is in the pages of Brantôme that the picturesque historians and romantic novelists have often sought inspiration for their accounts of the teeming activity and the pageantry of the sixteenth century.

Brantôme's patroness Marguerite de Valois (1553–1615), the divorced first wife of Henry IV, dedicated her memoirs to Brantôme. They were written while she was in semi-exile at the castle of Usson in Auvergne. Her writings have little historical value, but are an interesting example of personal literature and of feminine self-portraiture, for the purpose of defence and exculpation against unfavorable opinion, told with a good deal of vividness and elegance.

Very different from a literary point of view are the *Mémoires-journaux* of Pierre de l'Estoile (1546–1611). This daily record of events from 1574 to 1611 is of the greatest use for understanding the history of the period between the death of Charles IX and that of Henry IV. L'Estoile's impartiality is equalled only by his curiosity and interest, and we may add his accuracy, but, except spasmodically, he has not the touch of the man of letters.

The writers on political science and the theory of history become more numerous and more valuable to modern thought

along with the growth of the spirit of rationalism. The downfall of the principle of authority, together with the sifting of tradition and the clash of idea against idea, resulting in part from the rival thought of Catholics and Reformers, wrought a change in the study of institutions. One instance of this improvement has already been mentioned in the *Recherches de la France* of Etienne Pasquier. But other writers were no less significant.

Important names in the reform of legal studies in the sixteenth century were Cujas and Hotman. Jacques Cujas (1522-1590), in spite of his great merits, was too technically a legist to obtain a place here, but François Hotman (1524–1590) influenced general thought and discussion. The two occupy the chief position among those who, following the lead of the Italian Alciati, revolted against the old school of uncouth interpreters of Roman law, the Bartholists, disciples of Accursius and Bartholus, who used the glosses and formularies. Hotman, as a Huguenot, criticised also the errors of canon law and the papal decretals. Cujas and Hotman tried to set forth jurisprudence as a scientific system and not as a mere set of arbitrary rules. This end they sought by the historical method, and Hotman, in particular, by the application of philological and antiquarian studies. But Hotman is especially important as the author of the *Franco-Gallia*, published in Latin in 1573 and translated into French in the following year by Simon Goulard under the name *la Gaule franque*. Hotman, as a spokesman for the Huguenots, sought to establish a historical justification for the political aspirations of the Reformers, and tried to prove that in the old days of Gaul and under the Franks, there had existed free confederations and an elective monarchy. The *Franco-Gallia* was one of the chief sources of inspiration to the Huguenots. These argued the right to rebel against a despot and to establish a semi-independence or federative republic, almost an *imperium in imperio* in the Kingdom of France, or to set up a constitutional monarchy in which the States-General should counterbalance the royal power. Its influence in the sixteenth century has been compared to that

of Rousseau's *Contrat social* in the eighteenth, and even the Ligueurs and Jesuits, when they found themselves in the opposition as the Reformers had been, unconsciously adopted their arguments in justification of the murder of an unrighteous tyrant. From the historical standpoint, also, Hotman's *Franco-Gallia* was significant in that it was, with the *Recherches* of Pasquier and the *Antiquités françaises* of Claude Fauchet (1530–1601), one of the first important works to reject the Trojan legend of the origins of France.

The Huguenots adopted also La Boétie's *Contr'un, ou discours de la servitude volontaire*, which a modern writer has inconclusively attributed to Montaigne. Though eloquent and well written, it is practically a schoolboy essay and is a declamation in favor of liberty based on the reading of ancient authors. Another work taken by the Huguenots as a source of political argument was the Latin *Vindiciae contra tyrannos*, published under the pseudonym of Junius Brutus and attributed both to Hubert Languet (1518–1581) and to Du Plessis-Mornay (1549–1623). This work discusses the questions of obedience to a ruler acting in opposition to the law of God or as an oppressor of his subjects, and argues that a foreign ruler is justified in coming to the help of his coreligionaries when they are oppressed by their own sovereign.

The greatest political scientist of the sixteenth century was Jean Bodin (1530–1596). His chief works were the Latin *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*, and the French *Six livres de la république*, the latter of which has been called the most important book on political science between the times of Aristotle and Montesquieu. He was also guilty of unexpectedly superstitious works, such as the *Démonomanie des sorciers*. The *Methodus* considers questions like the pleasure of historical study, its utility for the knowledge of politics. It touches on the theory of physical causes, as the influence of climate and of the environment. These last ideas are taken up again in the *République*, so that Bodin is an important precursor of Montes-

quieu and similar writers. The *République*, a defence of absolute monarchy, is in part a rejoinder to the Protestant arguments of Hotman, but it rises much higher than mere polemic to general theory. Bodin deals with the question of sovereignty, which is absolute and perpetual power. Hence Bodin is the mouthpiece of those theorists of the French monarchy as it did exist until the Revolution, a mitigated despotism in which an acknowledged authority ought to be tempered by justice, mercy, and toleration, or forms of natural and divine law. In Bodin's own day the members of the party which represented these ideas were called the *politiques*, and they corresponded to those who in modern times have been called the moderates or "centre." Michel de l'Hospital was in the sixteenth century an important leader of this set.

The *Satire Ménippée*, which takes its name from the Latin *Menippean Satires* of Varro, is the great political prose satire of its century. It was the product of writers belonging to the middle *bourgeois* group of *politiques* hostile to the Ligue and to the Spaniards, whom the Guises had called to their help. These authors, who saw in the reign of Henry IV the salvation of France, were six in number: Jacques Gillot, Pierre Le Roy, Pierre Pithou (1539–1596), Florent Chrestien (1540–1596), Nicolas Rapin (1535–1608), Jean Passerat. Chrestien and Passerat are famous in other connections. To Le Roy is attributed the general plan of the satire, and he probably wrote the beginning. There are identifications and surmises as to other portions of the work, but it is a collaboration in which the anonymity of each section was at least intended to be preserved. The *Satire Ménippée*, or *De la vertu du catholicon d'Espagne et de la tenue des états de Paris*, begins with an address in the style of a vendor of nostrums on the virtues of the catholicon or cure-all. There follows an account of the convocation of the States and of the various addresses supposed to be made there, each one of which is composed to suit the character of the speaker. The longest is that of Claude d'Aubray, who speaks for the

bourgeoisie, supposed to be due to Pithou. It is also the most serious part of the satire and discusses the political condition of France. The work ends with various miscellaneous compositions in prose and verse.

The *Satire Ménippée* cannot be appreciated today, because everything about is has become obsolete, but it is an important document in French literature.

PART III

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

CHAPTER I

TRANSITION WRITERS. THE REIGN OF HENRY IV

BY the reign of Henry IV the Renaissance has wellnigh run its course and, as so often happens in France, the end of the century seems to coincide with a change in the national spirit and in the literary tendencies. Many of the important sixteenth-century writers still live, though in most cases they remain representatives of the past. Among those we have already dealt with, Pasquier, Brantôme, d'Aubigné, Montchrestien, Larivey, Du Vair survive the reign, and Charron is one of its writers.

But the differences which separate the Classicism of the seventeenth century from the Renaissance Classicism are already visible, though for a while French thought seems to be marking time. In the sixteenth century the prevailing mood was eminently individualistic. The great writers had, as we have seen, rejected mediæval authority and traditions, and sought, with the guidance of the ancients and, unfortunately, also of the Italians, to express the fullest development of their natures. They had tried to substitute Plato or the real Aristotle for the false Aristotle, or they had discarded the mediæval *genres* for those of the ancients. In this way we explain the large amount of personal literature, from the abundant lyrical poetry to the wealth of memoirs, or the studies of self such as the essays of Montaigne.

In more abstract thought the writers had been united only in one negative and destructive principle, but the liberty of each person had led him to solve the problems of the world according to the bias of his own feeling. The moralist might equally well become a Christian or a pagan Stoic, the pure intellectual rationalist a Catholic, a Huguenot, or a sceptic. Hence, besides

Catholicism, there came the new religion of the Reformers, based at first on the Bible interpreted by the judgment of one's own conscience, though soon, in France at least, only by the judgment of Calvin's conscience; or scepticism, popular in Montaigne, philosophical in Sanchez; or neo-Platonism transmitted from Italy, with its outgrowth in the mysticism which peopled the world with gnomes, sylphs, angels, demons, and salamanders. Parallel with this tendency was the one to make science imaginative and in harmony with the poetical interpretations of the universe, the study of alchemy, astrology, magic, and the black arts, the search for the philosopher's stone. Thus the excessive liberty of the Renaissance became chaos, and there was no method in science. The "fais ce que voudras" of Rabelais might be placed over the home of every thinker. The Pléiade had endeavored to cultivate the types of literature, but, in spite of its theories, it had failed to reach its ideals and soon lost all sense of judgment and appreciation of taste. Even Ronsard in much of his work, Du Bartas and Desportes nearly everywhere, are lacking in what the French call *goût*.

A reaction against this anarchy, which is distasteful to the French mind, arose early. Its aspects were political as well as intellectual. With the Counter Reformation began in Europe the revival of Catholic authority which culminated in France, after the civil wars, in the political unification under Henry IV, now a member of the Catholic Church. The Reason of the Infallible Church gradually replaced faith based on fallible individual conscience, just as the national state took the place of the quasi-independence in politics which the Huguenots wanted, or the treachery of the League. The minister Sully, by his administration and executive reforms, gave ballast to the brilliancy and Gascon lightheadedness of the king. Henry won the popular fancy by his picturesque sayings, the "panache blanc," the "poule au pot," or "Paris vaut bien une messe," and by dashing oaths, the *ventrebleus* of a "roi vert galant." Sully did the work of centralisation or directed the king in

finances, agriculture, commerce, public works, and planned the "grand projet," the federation of nations and churches and the lowering of the house of Hapsburg, in which Henry was interested more by his senile passion for the princesse de Condé than by anything else. Richelieu under Louis XIII continued the promotion of royal authority by humiliating the nobility, which had hitherto preserved a semblance of feudal independence on their estates, but soon became the fawning courtiers of Versailles, and by crushing the Huguenots. He augmented the prestige of France abroad and extended its territory by his participation in the Thirty Years' War, ended by the treaty of Westphalia. And above all, he annexed men of letters by his patronage of writers and by the establishment of the Academy. Thus literature was made to enter into the state organism. Mazarin, with less genius but as much craft as Richelieu, continued the work which the former had begun, and managing to play off against each other during the Fronde the nobles and the Parlement, who tried to balance royal authority, and defeating Spain by the treaty of the Pyrenees, he left at his death in 1661 the work of centralisation complete. The so-called school of 1660, the French Classical age, corresponds to the centralised government and the mitigated despotism of Louis the Great.

In literature the same unification shows itself as in politics after the reign of Henry IV. Malherbe tried to introduce taste by doing away with the exuberance of the past generation and making poetry reasonable, meanwhile eliminating the personal element. By the time of Boileau this taste or good sense (*le bon sens*) is dignified with the name of "Reason," though it does not mean much more than before. In prose Balzac attempted the same task, though his tendencies were toward the grandiloquent and the rhetorical. Pascal was needed to give style depth and power. Chapelain tried to set the house of criticism in order by establishing the technical rules which distinguish and may produce good tragedies, comedies, and epics. Meanwhile, the partisans of liberty were not to pass

away without a struggle. They showed themselves in the protests of Regnier and of Mlle de Gournay against the pruning of Malherbe, in the outbursts of Théophile in favor of liberty of expression. The irregulars of the early seventeenth century think themselves the Brutuses and Cassiuses of literary freedom. In religion these same writers are apt, under the name of libertines, to continue the tendencies of free-thought, pyrrhonism, or scepticism of many sixteenth-century thinkers, some of them of the lineage of Montaigne, and are dubbed by their enemies unbelievers and atheists. A libertine meant one who was free, like the wind, the "chartered libertine" of Shakspere, but as the members of the school were often without moral or religious principles, the new meaning given to their name was only too well deserved. Licentiousness made many of the libertines deserving of the name of *poètes bachiques*, as exuberance of style made some merit the name of "grotesques."

In abstract thought the new tendency toward system was personified in Descartes, who had to carry the cult of reason beyond the stage of Ramus. That philosopher had found reason in Plato and in the writings of the ancients. Descartes thinks he finds it in one self-evident proposition or analytic judgment, which exists in the mind of man and which permits the construction of the whole internal and external world upon a firm foundation. Thus a new thought replaces the thought of the ancients, whether as interpreted by the Platonists of the school of Ramus or the old Aristotelians of the Scholastic type who still held the university, from which even the Humanists of the Renaissance had been unable to dislodge them. At the same time Descartes's new method not only does away with the chaos of unsystematic thought, but establishes a new physical interpretation of the world in place of the varied fanciful beliefs of the sixteenth-century men of pseudo-science.

The result of these political, social, literary, and philosophical changes finds expression in the reign of Louis XIV after his majority. Louis is the "roi-soleil," *sol nec pluribus impar*,

surrounded by fawning courtiers and literary men. French literature is, to use Taine's expression, the *littérature de Versailles*. The king affects literature by his pensions and by the necessity of winning his favor to get into the Academy which, in turn, takes upon itself the right to control the language. He is at the same time the subject of apotheosis: Louis could almost say "*Ut puto, Deus fio.*" The Catholic religion was supreme, and the Gallicans would even have liked a quasi-independence of the king at the head of the Church, face to face with the pope.

Considered in its deeper import, French literature of the school of 1660 presents features of which Cartesianism is one of the best, but not the only manifestation. The qualities of the *esprit classique*, its sympathetic historians tell us, are clearness of conception, precision of definition, and logical arrangement: "la clarté, la précision, la liaison des idées." French literature becomes a generalised image of life, "la réalité dont on a retranché les traits grossiers et superflus" (Nisard). Its character is "la recherche et l'expression de la vérité." Imagination is auxiliary to reason, and conformity to reason is conformity to truth; hence an essentially orderly and logical conception of everything, and a clear and logical expression in literature of such conceptions. It becomes, on the one hand, the rationalism of Descartes, on the other, the *Art poétique* of Boileau; or, as M. Brunetière expressed it in his work on nineteenth-century lyric poetry, it is "cette connexion intime ou solidarité des idées que l'on tire du rapport d'un traité métaphysique de Malebranche, de l'un de ces 'magnifiques palais d'idées,' comme on aimait à en construire alors, — avec le palais lui-même et les jardins de Versailles, avec une tragédie de Racine, ou avec une oraison funèbre de Bossuet. Même savante et grandiose ordonnance du plan; même habile et heureuse disposition des parties, même art; même principe intérieur et caché; même inspiration ou même âme."[1]

[1] Brunetière borrows the inspiration of this passage from Taine: "Entre une charmille de Versailles, un raisonnement philosophique et théologique

As opposed to the sixteenth century the new literature is governed, not from within by the personality of the writer, but from without. The lyrical element of the Pléiade is destroyed by Malherbe. Thought is under the rule of reason, and in literature Boileau identifies common sense or good taste with it:

> Aimez donc la raison, que toujours vos écrits
> Empruntent d'elle seule et leur lustre et leur prix.

It took, however, fifty years to prepare the *siècle de Louis XIV*, and in that half-century there is much that is at variance with this centralising force or hostile to it. And, first of all, it is well to see what was the condition of literature at the advent of Malherbe, in the reign of Henry IV. Apart from the authors whom it has been necessary to mention in other connections, the most famous names were those of Bertaut, Regnier, Cardinal Du Perron, Passerat. Saint François de Sales and Du Plessis-Mornay were also leaders among the Catholics and Huguenots respectively. Olivier de Serres by his *Théâtre d'agriculture* continues the series of technical writers, among whom the surgeon Ambroise Paré and the ceramist Bernard Palissy had distinguished themselves a little earlier. To the modern student of literary theory Vauquelin de la Fresnaye is one of the most valuable of all.

Jean Bertaut (1552–1611) has been immortalised by the couplet of Boileau linking his name with that of Desportes:

> Ce poète orgueilleux [*Ronsard*], trébuché de si haut,
> Rendit plus retenus Desportes et Bertaut.

de Malebranche, un précepte de versification chez Boileau, une loi de Colbert sur les hypothèques, un compliment d'antichambre à Marly, une sentence de Bossuet sur la royauté de Dieu, la distance semble infinie et infranchissable; nulle liaison apparente. Les faits sont si dissemblables qu'au premier aspect on les juge tels qu'ils se présentent, c'est-à-dire isolés et séparés. Mais les faits communiquent entre eux par la définition des groupes où ils sont compris, comme les eaux d'un bassin par les sommets du versant d'où elles découlent." — Preface of *Essais de critique et d'histoire.*

He was really a minor poet, though deified in his own day. After a career of court favor he ended his days as a bishop, occupant of the small see of Séez in his native Normandy, and the successor of another bishop, Claude de Morenne, who had also dabbled in verse. Bertaut ran through the stock literary forms: he was a Petrarchist, a court poet composing sonnets and ballets, a translator of the classics, and a paraphraser of the Psalms. He even tried once or twice to soar to the epic strain. He was a little more reserved in his poetry than his Italianist contemporaries and, indeed, shows greater restraint in the treatment of passion, impressing one as more a gentleman than Desportes. His style is less overladen with florid similes, but his delicacy and fastidiousness make him one of the first and greatest elaborators of *pointes* in the early seventeenth century. He shows pleasing sentiment in some of his descriptions of nature, a gentle melancholy in his elegiac verse which is sometimes in the key of Lamartine, but his work as a whole, though sympathetic, is weak and tedious.

Mathurin Regnier (1573–1613), nephew of Desportes, made many trips to Italy and lived there for a number of years, but was in the latter part of his life a canon of Chartres. He is an intense partisan of the old literature against the encroachments of Malherbe and his reforms; at the same time he is one of the founders in France of the formal satire. In this way he belongs to two schools, to two times.

We have had many evidences of satire in authors like Marot and Du Bellay. Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, too, wrote regular satires as a mere plagiarist of Horace and of the Italians. They were, moreover, almost contemporary in their actual appearance with those of Regnier.

Regnier is, of course, by no means free from imitation, but he makes the qualities of the models more his own, so that he stands apart from all his predecessors. The direct classical influences upon Regnier, except Horace and Juvenal, are slighter than in those who were more strictly Humanists. But it is only natural

that one who had spent so much time in Italy should be full of the contemporary Italian writers. Regnier drew largely from poets such as Ariosto, authors of personal satirical epistles, and among his models were, in addition to Ariosto, men like Vinciguerra, Alamanni, Bentivoglio, and Sansovino. He drew, too, from Aretino and from the authors of *capitoli* and Bernesque satire, burlesque poems in which common or low things were treated in semi-heroic or eulogistic strain: Berni, Molza, Firenzuola. As a true Frenchman, also, he went back to those who in his own language stood for the *esprit gaulois*, such as Rabelais. In his poems he gives a heedless view of life and character. He is a thoughtless epicurean *débauché* and takes a careless satisfaction in making fun, often obscenely, of what he sees about him. He is perfectly unmoral, heedless of art and style, using the common vulgar talk about him to describe hypocrites, prostitutes, conceited fops. Yet such is the vigor and originality of his language and analysis of character that he counts among the founders of a new *genre*, which showed its formal perfection in Boileau, its spirit in Molière, but which was also responsible in the seventeenth century for many a minor satirical writer like Du Lorens.

The most noteworthy satires of Regnier are his poems against Malherbe and his *Macette*.

The tone of the satire against Malherbe as a defence of the old school of poetry may be seen by the lines:

> Mais, Rapin, à leur goût, si les vieux sont profanes,
> Si Virgile, le Tasse et Ronsard sont des ânes,
> Sans perdre en ces discours le temps que nous perdons,
> Allons comme eux aux champs et mangeons des chardons.

Macette is often called a female prototype of Tartuffe. She is a descendant of innumerable female panderers in literature, derived ultimately from Ovid's *Amores* and connected directly or indirectly with the Spanish Celestina, the courtesans of Italian literature, and the *maquerelles* of the French Renaissance comedy. On this conception Regnier grafted the hypocrisy of a Faux-

Semblant of the *Roman de la Rose*. Macette has become pious the better to deceive her victims:

> Elle qui n'eut avant que pleurer son délit
> Autre ciel pour objet que le ciel de son lit,
> A changé de courage, et confite en détresse,
> Imite avec ses pleurs la sainte pécheresse.
> Donnant des saintes lois à son affection,
> Elle a mis son amour à la dévotion.
> Sans art elle s'habille, et simple en contenance,
> Son teint mortifié prêche la continence.
> Clergesse, elle fait jà la leçon aux prêcheurs,
> Elle lit Saint Bernard, le Guide des Pécheurs,
> Les Méditations de la mère Thérèse,
> Sait que c'est qu'hypostase avec synderese.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Loin du monde elle fait sa demeure et son gîte,
> Son œil tout pénitent ne pleure qu'eau bénite.

Jean Passerat (1534–1602), a scholar and a toper, one of the authors of the *Satire Ménippée*, composed, besides more ambitious works like the *Chien courant*, many epigrams and light poems which bring one back to the gaiety of the verse of Marot and the love-songs of the early Pléiade.

Cardinal Jacques Davy Du Perron (1556–1618) was a windy and wordy nonentity. He, like Desportes, was a favorite court poet and brought Malherbe before Henry IV. He wrote, like Bertaut and Malherbe, semi-official panegyrics and elegies, but distanced all his friends and rivals by his eloquence and his successful logical argumentations. He gave the funeral oration of Ronsard and, in a controversy on the eucharist with the Huguenot theologian Du Plessis-Mornay, he won a noteworthy dialectical victory which almost broke his rival's heart.

Vauquelin de la Fresnaye (1536–1606 or 08), a Norman judge who devoted his spare hours to poetry, passed through a phase of imitation in his *Foresteries* and his *Satires*, the latter unblushingly cribbed from Italian writers. His value today lies entirely in his *Art poëtique* in three cantos, published at the

very end of his life, but on the stocks for many years, and enunciating in didactic verse the theories of the Pléiade at a time when they had acquired definite shape. Indeed, the vogue of the Pléiade had already passed away. Vauquelin's conception of the literary types is, on the whole, that of Ronsard. The ode is serious and stately yet ornate, destined for the delectation of lords and ladies. Yet it is surpassed by the Anacreontic ode or odelette, "Pleine de jeu d'amour, douce et mignardelette." The epic portrays human life in all its variety, and Vauquelin's conception, in spite of his admiration for Ronsard and the scholarly poets, seems to admit a broader interpretation than the learned epic of which the *Franciade* was the type. The drama is a more specific entity and is closely studied. Tragedy admits, as in Greece, only three actors and the chorus takes a part, yet the play is not confined to classical topics. Comedy portrays in easy metre a deed of vice, such as seduction, which can be remedied, for instance, by marriage. The Latin and Italian influences are here obvious. Tragi-comedy is a play portraying a tragic action, but with a happy ending.

In this way Vauquelin deals with nearly all the forms cultivated in his day, sonnet, pastoral, satire, epistle, didactic verse, including all the minor *genres*. His treatment is absolutely incoherent and unarranged, and is in this respect in marked contrast with the systematic treatise on poetry of Boileau. Yet, none the less, Vauquelin's conception of the history of literary *genres* is often more correct than that of the later writer. This very fact is considered a proof that, in spite of the numerous similarities in the two works, due probably to their imitation of common originals, Boileau did not use the work of the poet-lawyer of Caen when he composed his own code of poetry.

CHAPTER II

THE REFORM IN POETRY. MALHERBE. HIS FRIENDS AND FOES

FRANÇOIS DE MALHERBE (1555–1628) is the starting-point of seventeenth-century literature and one who must be held chief builder in poetry of the definite Classical theory. He accomplished his task mainly by destroying lyric poetry.

He was a Norman of a Huguenot family, but himself a Catholic, well educated and travelled. He lived for a long time as secretary of the duc d'Angoulême in the south of France, where he wrote his first verses, an elegy on the death of a young girl, Geneviève Rouxel, as were his later and more famous verses to Du Périer. Thus at Ronsard's death he was an unknown person in literature and under Italian influences. In 1587 came his *Larmes de saint Pierre*, an adaptation of the primitive version of the *Lagrime di san Pietro* of Luigi Tansillo and, like its model, an example of the worst kind of Italianate affectedness and artificiality. But many years of his life, though unproductive, were spent in reflection. It was not until 1605 that he was presented to the king and began a career of prosperous old age when, in spite of grief at the death of his son, he stood high in favor at court, was the oracle of his clique and the reformer of poetry.

Malherbe was pushing and energetic, selfish and vindictive against people like Concini and Luynes, eager for preferment. He was salacious and nicknamed "le père Luxure." His old age was devoted to the pruning of the literature represented by the school of Ronsard and more particularly of Desportes. He was not a poet himself, except in the most limited degree, and

he failed to understand the true meaning of lyric poetry as the expression of subjective emotion. Malherbe saw in poetry only the statement of general truths and glorified commonplaces. In this it is obvious that he was performing a salutary task for literature, even though he went too far, because poetry had departed from the true norm and was floundering in incoherence. Malherbe brought in dignity, though a stilted one, a highly polished prosody and phraseology. This was meritorious, inasmuch as the ideas of the greatest literary men of the Classical age could take care of themselves. But certainly the high esteem in which Malherbe was held for centuries in French literature has been due as much to the praise of Boileau as to his own achievements. He was really the grammarian of poetry. He was argumentative, dialectical, fond of antithesis, rational, never sentimental.

In many respects Malherbe's conception of lyric poetry, more particularly the ode, was that of the Pléiade, and Malherbe transmitted the mythological trappings of Pindarism from Ronsard to Boileau. When it came to questions of detail, out of stubbornness he usually took an opposite view. Thus, as to language he was diametrically at variance with the school of Ronsard. Instead of admitting two vocabularies, one for prose and one for poetry, as is the case to a certain degree in English, Malherbe ordained one language for the two, distinguished only by rhyme and guided by popular usage. This did away with much that Ronsard had eagerly advocated: grafting of words, diminutives and compounds, borrowings from trades and dialects, Greek and Latin constructions. Malherbe half jestingly said that he took his vocabulary from the common laborers and street porters. Poetry was to be a work of art, and the poet's chief task in composition was a selective one, the chastening of his own muse and the cutting out of anything that might in any way jar the ear, the suppression of padding, *bourres* and *chevilles*, the avoiding of hiatus.

Such is the doctrine which Malherbe taught orally and

recorded with insolent comments in the margins of his copy of Desportes. He was not always consistent, and at times he made the mistakes for which he blamed others, even after his early stage of Italianism. He boasted of driving "Gasconisms" from the court, but his critics say he "Normanised" it. He was a poet without poetical feeling and stands for the reaction against the excesses of sixteenth-century Italianism, of which reaction he was perhaps less a cause than an illustration. But he also stands for the transition from Middle to Modern French and from the loose language and constructions of the Renaissance to the more "reasonable" ones of the seventeenth century.

The most quoted poem of Malherbe is a consolation to a friend, M. Du Périer, on the death of his daughter, in the vein of stoic declamation, like the letter of Plutarch to his wife and that of Servius Sulpicius Rufus to Cicero on the ineluctability of death:

Mais elle était du monde où les plus belles choses
Ont le pire destin;
Et rose, elle a vécu ce que vivent les roses,
L'espace d'un matin.[1]

The stanzas are perfect in their rigidity, but the appeal to

[1] Compare the lines on death with those in Gray's Elegy:

The boast of heraldry, the pomp of power,
And all that beauty, all that wealth e'er gave,
Await alike the inevitable hour: —
The paths of glory lead but to the grave.

La mort a des rigueurs à nulle autre pareilles;
On a beau la prier,
La cruelle qu'elle est se bouche les oreilles,
Et nous laisse crier.

Le pauvre en sa cabane, où le chaume le couvre,
Est sujet à ses lois;
Et la garde qui veille aux barrières du Louvre
N'en défend pas nos rois.

reason or to general law is the kind of consolation that never healed grief.[1]

The ode to Marie de Médicis is considered by some his masterpiece in lyric verse, and his poems on the death of Henry IV and on the expedition of Louis XIII against La Rochelle stand out from the others.

The procedure of Malherbe in composition is, then, slow elaboration. His verses are colorless and impersonal in form and content. He does not so much seek melody as the harmony of impeccable construction. His verse must be exact, his language accurate, without a jarring or discordant note, but without vigor or positive beauty. Malherbe's chief positive feature is the Johnsonian enunciation of sententious maxims and platitudes which the poets of the past had already popularised. He was the "docteur en négative" of Balzac and Mlle de Gournay. He stands for the calm and the whiteness of antique statuary as we now have it, not for the polychrome wealth which Hellenic art really possessed. Of ancient literature he cared in Greek for but little except Lucian and Plutarch: he hated the "galimatias" of Pindar, says Racan. In Latin he liked the philosophical Seneca, Ovid, and especially Horace and Statius. Racan tells us that "Virgile n'avait pas l'honneur de lui plaire." [2]

[1] "C'est consoler un philosophe que de lui justifier ses larmes, et de mettre sa douleur en liberté," Molière wrote to La Mothe le Vayer on the death of the latter's son. The difference is, however, striking between Malherbe's poem and the one to Malherbe himself from Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, on the death of Malherbe's daughter. M. Allais quotes the lines:

Pourquoi, Malherbe, dolent père,
Regrettes-tu ta fille chère,
Puisque la belle infantelette
Est ore aux cieux une angelette?
T'est-il pas une grand' louange
D'avoir été père d'un ange?

[2] Fairness and candor compel the admission that the above judgment of Malherbe is not the only possible one and that his character and influence

Malherbe was the centre of an admiring group of disciples, like Ben Jonson at the Mermaid Tavern or Dryden at Will's Coffee House. He did not admit too many of them at once into his intimacy. Two alone are to be picked out from the rest, François Maynard (1582–1646) and Racan, and of these Racan was a much truer poet than his master.

Honorat de Bueil, marquis de Racan (1589–1670), was in his long life destined to see the whole career of Corneille and the rise of Molière and Racine. He was a distinguished *seigneur* in the army, where he served at the siege of La Rochelle, at court, and in literature. Yet he had an uncouth appearance at variance with the grace of his poetry. He lived for many years in later life away from Paris on his country estates, and even by the fastidious Boileau it was said that "Racan pourrait chanter au défaut d'un Homère."

The writings of Racan are varied and fairly numerous. He filled a volume with his version of the Psalms and played the Boswell to Malherbe in a little set of biographical anecdotes in which he pays homage to his master: "M. de Malherbe de qui il a appris ce qu'il a témoigné savoir depuis de la poésie française." But his chief distinction is to be found in the *Bergeries* and in sundry lyric poems of which *la Retraite* is the most famous.

Les Bergeries is the best pastoral play in French. It is, as is usual with pastorals, an extremely involved drama, lacking

may be judged in a different light. In the opinion of his defenders Malherbe not only performed a meritorious negative task in sweeping away the degenerate literature of the late sixteenth century, but his writings have majesty, nobility, and dignity. Thus, for instance, Sainte-Beuve in his essay on Malherbe in the thirteenth volume of the *Nouveaux lundis:* "A Malherbe réservons la gloire et l'honneur de l'harmonie, de la fierté, de la gravité, d'un haut sens et de la distinction dans la grandeur. . . . La probité, quoiqu'il en soit, subsiste, même sous les défauts de Malherbe; son caractère privé, bien qu'étroit, est solide et suffit à porter, sans jamais fléchir, sa grandeur lyrique." — See also *De l'antipathie contre Malherbe*, by Charles Dejob in the *Revue internationale de l'enseignement*, 15 May, 1892 (Vol. XXIII).

almost in unity of plot, yet containing here and there many a graceful line. The *Retraite* is an expression of the sentimental epicureanism of the Pléiade and of Desportes's shepherd songs, drawn ultimately from Horace, with some of the firmness and concision of Malherbe. It repeats the already hackneyed literary commonplace about the call of solitude, and distaste for the turmoil of the town, the feeling that this world is too much with us:

> Tircis, il faut penser à faire la retraite:
> La course de nos jours est plus qu'à demi faite.
> L'âge insensiblement nous conduit à la mort.
> Nous avons assez vu sur la mer de ce monde
> Errer au gré des vents notre nef vagabonde;
> Il est temps de jouir des délices du port.

Such is, indeed, the characteristic of Racan's verse. He understands the softer moods of nature and sings the charms of a quiet landscape as one who has long lived in it, and whose life passes comforted by a dutiful wife in a peaceful home, but mildly saddened by sentimental recollections of earlier loves who disdained him. Racan was a personal poet such as Malherbe could never be, and in spite of his common exterior he was a true gentleman of letters.

The foes of Malherbe were as numerous as his friends. There were the vigorous partisans of the past literature like Regnier and Mlle de Gournay (1565–1645). This worthy *fille d'alliance* of Montaigne, who devoted her life to his posthumous fame, in her solitary spinsterhood scoffed at by the young blades in society and literature, shows how quickly the fashions of the sixteenth century were fading. She is best known, apart from her edition of Montaigne, by her *Ombre*, later called the *Avis ou Présents de la demoiselle de Gournay*, miscellaneous writings of sixteenth-century prolixity of style and not very rich in valuable thought.

As unlike Malherbe as Regnier and Mlle de Gournay, but for different reasons, stood the group of *libertins*. Even when

these writers did not lay themselves open to charges of atheism and of profligacy, they represented in literature all that Malherbe opposed: liberty of thought and of expression. They did not want theories; hence we find among them a large group of heedless lyric poets and of bohemian tavern roisterers. They did not do much for the Classical ideal, but they showed that the lyric spirit of French literature might have been saved if it had been reformed by a broader-minded man than Malherbe.

The most noteworthy of the *libertins* was Théophile de Viau (1596–1626), a southerner who led an adventurous career. Huguenot by descent he was, though a convert *pro forma* to Catholicism, persecuted by the Jesuits for his participation in the licentious *Parnasse satirique* and threatened with death. His attitude toward life and letters stands forth in the following lines:

"Il faut avoir de la passion non seulement pour les hommes de vertu, pour les belles femmes, mais aussi pour toutes sortes de belles choses. J'aime des beaux jours, des claires fontaines, l'aspect des montagnes, l'étendue d'une grande plaine, de belles forêts, l'Océan, son calme, ses vagues, ses nuages. J'aime encore tout ce qui touche plus particulièrement les sens, la musique, les fleurs, les beaux habits, la chasse, les beaux chevaux, les bonnes odeurs, la bonne chère; mais à tout cela mon désir ne s'attache que pour se plaire et non pour se travailler.

Théophile is best known by his irregular tragedy, the *Amours tragiques de Pirame et Thisbé*, which Boileau ridiculed because of the lines:

> Le voilà, le poignard qui du sang de son maître
> S'est souillé lâchement; il en rougit, le traître.[1]

[1] This example of preciosity has been used to outweigh whatever good thing else there is in the play; though, as M. Jusserand points out in his work on the English novel, Gloucester in Henry VI says "See how my sword weeps for the poor king's death," and when Brutus stabbed Cæsar the blood followed the dagger,

> As rushing out of doors to be resolved
> If Brutus so unkindly knocked or no.

The general spirit of Théophile's other verse, his *stances*, his odes, his elegies, is an appreciation of the soft and sometimes melancholy side of nature, though injured by the excesses of growing preciosity and by the obscenity into which he fell. Théophile was in spirit a poet of nature like Racan, but too often conformity to nature became with him yielding to drink and debauchery. In this he is representative of the *poètes bachiques*.

Notorious among these were d'Assoucy, Linière, and Faret, pilloried by Boileau, the last of whom it has been said won immortality and scorn because his name had a convenient rhyme in *cabaret;* Jacques Des Barreaux, atheist and drunkard; Guillaume Colletet, the author of lives of the sixteenth-century poets, and his beggarly son François. The greatest of the irregulars were Saint-Amant and Cyrano de Bergerac.

Marc-Antoine de Gérard, sieur de Saint-Amant (1594–1661), though a tavern poet, was a member of the Academy and a traveller to distant lands, England, Poland, Italy. He wrote grotesque poems or *caprices*, such as his *Rome ridicule* or *Albion*, and even his heroic and epic verse like the *Moïse sauvé* was at times unconsciously grotesque when, to repeat the instance at which Boileau laughed, the astonished fish hastened to gaze from their walls of water at the Hebrews passing by them through the Red Sea. But in shorter and less ambitious poems, such as *la Solitude* or *le Contemplateur*, Saint-Amant shows the romantic touch of nature which is one of the characteristics of his school and which the Classicists discard.

Savinien de Cyrano de Bergerac (1619–1655), a follower of Gassendi, though not a Gascon himself had the Gascon temperament and served in a Gascon military company, making himself the talk of Paris by his duels and brawls. His tragedy *Agrippine* contains the character of Sejanus who seemed to the people of

To this may be added Crashaw's "Nympha [for *lympha*] pudica Deum vidit, et erubuit," ("The conscious water saw its God and blushed") of the miracle of water turned to wine, or the "Unmannerly breech'd with gore" of Macbeth.

the time the mouthpiece of an atheistical author. His comedy *le Pédant joué*, though dull in itself, was important enough to give suggestions to Racine for his *Plaideurs* and to Molière for his *Fourberies de Scapin*. His imaginary journeys to the moon and to the sun, stuffed with pseudo-science and a vehicle for disquisitions by fiction on manners and morals, were a model for *Gulliver's Travels* and Voltaire's *Micromégas*. His correspondence is in the worst style of fantastic preciosity. Cyrano was not a genius, but his intellectual boldness and unconventionality made him push on beyond his contemporaries, and a little effort on the part of the modern reader enables him to read into Cyrano much that later knowledge has determined, and to see in him a forerunner of many doctrines of modern science and evolution. His nearest approach to majesty is in certain passages of the *Agrippine*, where phrases on life and death and the mystery of the hereafter have made some think that he knew and was influenced by Shakspere. The similarities do not, however, in all probability go beyond the influence of common models and inspiration.

CHAPTER III

THE REFORM IN PROSE AND THE GROWTH OF CRITICISM. BALZAC, THE ACADEMY, VAUGELAS, CHAPELAIN

THE efforts of a professional stylist like Malherbe had their counterpart in prose. Since the seventeenth century itself it has been customary to couple the name of Balzac with that of Malherbe, as doing for prose what Malherbe did for poetry; "Malherbe et Balzac si savants en beaux mots," says Molière in *les Femmes savantes*. This is to exaggerate Balzac's value, and his flatulent periods stand for little as compared with the work of Descartes or of Pascal. But in his own day he was perhaps even more esteemed than Malherbe. The contribution to seventeenth-century Classicism comes more from the dogmatic criticism of Chapelain and the efforts of the Academy, including Vaugelas, to give expression to the principles which Chapelain exemplified. Balzac is not, however, without importance in literature, and he did make some interesting contributions to the intellectual theories of his time.

Jean-Louis Guez de Balzac (1597-1654), after travelling in his youth in Holland and Italy, withdrew to Angoulême and to his remote estate of Balzac near there, where, except for a few visits to Paris, he spent the rest of his life. His weak health partly explains his solitude as "ermite de la Charente." But he was sought out as an oracle and elected a member of the new Academy, which he attended only a few times. At the Hôtel de Rambouillet, where again he was but rarely present in person, his word was law and his ideas were conveyed by letters and by written discourses or dissertations addressed to Mme de Rambouillet. In addition to his correspondence and *discours*,

Balzac's chief writings were the *Prince*, the *Socrate chrétien* and the posthumous *Aristippe*.

Through the sixteenth century, even or especially in Montaigne, prose had found expression in dragging and involved sentences, in which neither the meaning of the individual word was clearly defined nor the arrangement of parts consistent and logical. Balzac found the language as diffuse as Descartes did the thought. He became, as Sainte-Beuve calls him, the great epistolographer and builder of phrases. He polished his sentences and rounded out his periods, making of language a sonorous and rhythmic instrument, not musical but ponderous, measured, and majestic, aiming perhaps more at dignity than at meaning. It was the self-conscious *éloquence* or rhetoric of the Latinist. "Now that we are by ourselves," anecdote reports Balzac as saying, "we can talk without being on our guard against solecisms."

The defects of such a style are obvious: its strained antitheses and metaphors. It was a sort of pompous "verbocination," and Balzac was accused of "philautia." Nevertheless, he did good in making writers consider how they said a thing, and Bossuet's style is the perfection of what is seen in embryo in Balzac.

Aside from this, Balzac illustrated in his writings two important conceptions of the seventeenth century: the ancient Roman and the *honnête homme* or gentleman. The steadfast, cold patriot of Amyot and of Corneille appears in Balzac, and he also tries to analyse the polished man of the world of the days of Augustus and Mæcenas, noble, dignified, courteous, the type of *urbanité* as opposed to rusticity, or to the *vulgarité* with the invention of which Mme de Staël is credited in the nineteenth century. So the chevalier de Méré said: "On pourrait être fort homme de bien, et fort malhonnête homme. Il ne faut qu'être juste pour être homme de bien, et pour être honnête homme il se faut connaître à toutes sortes de bienséances et les savoir pratiquer." There is occasionally something Chesterfieldian about him. Balzac himself likens the *honnête homme* to the "highminded

man" or μεγαλοψυχός of Aristotle's *Ethics*, disdainful, preferring to do a service rather than to receive one, truthloving, never strong in his admirations, slow and dignified in demeanor, never excited. Thus to Andrew Marvell, Charles I was the true gentleman at the moment of his execution:

> He nothing common did nor mean
> Upon that memorable scene,
> But with his keener eye
> The axe's edge did try:
> Nor called the gods, with vulgar spite,
> To vindicate his helpless right;
> But bowed his comely head
> Down, as upon a bed.

Such are the ideas which Balzac develops in his dissertations to Mme de Rambouillet on *le Romain*, *De la conversation des Romains*, and *Mécenas*. The *Prince* is a survey of France under Louis XIII and an idealised portrait, full of flattery, of Louis le Juste. *Aristippe* discusses the court and the statesman.

Literary improvement was also the object of the formal establishment of the Academy, though its origin was the result of chance. About 1629, Pellisson the early historian of the Academy tells us, various men of letters fell into the way of meeting regularly at the house of Valentin Conrart, the talented writer, who lived in bachelor quarters near the centre of the town. Among them were Godeau, Gombauld, Chapelain, Giry, Habert, Cérizay, and Malleville. The meetings were followed by a walk or by a collation. They were at first kept secret, but indirectly the news reached Richelieu, whose emissary Boisrobert tried to persuade the members to form a definite organisation for the advancement of letters. There were models in the numerous Italian academies of the Renaissance, such as the Intronati of Siena, the della Crusca of Florence, the Humoristi and Fantastici of Rome, the Olimpici of Vicenza, the Innominati of Parma, the Ardenti of Naples, and many others. Indeed, the Académie du Palais could still be remembered as a model

near at home, and the Académie florimontane of Savoy in the beginning of the seventeenth century was probably not forgotten.

There was much hesitation in yielding, but in 1634 Conrart married, and the cardinal's pressure had its effect. By 1636 the Academy was organised, though the Parlement, jealous of Richelieu, did not ratify the charter until 1637. The members were men of contemporary importance, often forgotten today, but in the seventeenth century itself, Pascal, Descartes, and Molière were never members. There was doubt as to a suitable name. Should it be "Académie des beaux esprits," or "Académie de l'éloquence," or "Académie éminente" in honor of Richelieu? There was uncertainty as to an occupation, and the early meetings were taken up by lectures and addresses, as one on "le je ne sais quoi." Finally a definite plan was evolved comprising the study and codification of all the elements of French language and style. There was to be a dictionary to register the words, a grammar to classify expressions, a rhetoric, and a poetic. Of these the dictionary alone was carried out, and the first edition did not appear until 1694. The grammatical studies of Vaugelas took the place of the second scheme, and the works on rhetoric and poetry were never attempted. But the influence of the Academy since its foundation has been one of the strongest in the history of France, in organising and directing official literary theory, and in determining what is correct. Its effect has been at times reactionary; it has stood in the way of intellectual progress, it has often been fifty years behind the times. Its power has not been the less great.

Claude Favre de Vaugelas (1585–1650), a native of Savoy, wrote the *Remarques sur la langue française* (1647), in which he taught good use as test of French, taking as norm the language of polite society, especially ladies, of the court and of the best writers. Vaugelas became the great authority of the seventeenth century, the more so that he was not, like other critics, a rigid dogmatist promulgating laws for eternity, but on the contrary a recorder of current speech. He admitted the possibility of

changes and was merely careful to select the expressions of those *a priori* likely to be persons of taste and refinement.

Jean Chapelain (1595–1674) was the recognised leader in criticism and considered, with scarcely any justification, a great poet as well. His own opinion may be seen in the list of pensions he drew up for Colbert. Corneille was to receive 2000 livres, Molière 1000, Cotin 1200, Racine 800, and "Au sieur Chapelain, le plus grand poète français qui ait jamais été et du plus solide jugement, 2000 livres." Chapelain was an example of effort misplaced, for anything more prosaic among poets can scarcely be imagined. Still, he must be reckoned with decidedly in the history of the growth of Classicism.

Chapelain, who was a man of education familiar with ancient and modern languages, began in literature by a preface in 1623 to the *Adone* of the Italian Marino, in which he formulated the theory of the *épopée pacifique*. He became a frequenter of the Hôtel de Rambouillet, translated *Don Guzman de Alfarache*, took part in the gatherings at Conrart's, wrote an ode to Richelieu which earned for him the succession to Malherbe's place in favor. In 1632 he became secretary to the king. It was he who promulgated anew the theory of the unities, planned the dictionary of the Academy, drew up the judgment of the Academy on Corneille's *Cid*. Rather unexpectedly we find him in his dialogue *De la lecture des vieux romans*, a conversation with Ménage and Sarrasin, taking the defence of the old mediæval romances.

In literature Chapelain is found intimate with Mlle de Scudéry, as well as with the Hôtel de Rambouillet, and to her he is said to have suggested the *carte de Tendre*, for which she has been so much ridiculed. And in 1656, after years of incubation, appeared the first twelve books of his epic, *la Pucelle*. This application of the theories of the Humanistic epic, in which erudition and pompousness of detail took the place of poetry, was a great disappointment to his admirers: "C'est bien beau," said Mme de Longueville, "mais c'est bien ennuyeux." The

last twelve books were not printed until the nineteenth century, as a literary curiosity. Boileau turned loose the shafts of his ridicule on Chapelain, as a pedant and bore, but later chapters of this history will show that we cannot repeat Boileau's "Ma muse, laissons Chapelain pour la dernière fois." For, though uninspired by the divine fire, he is, for good or ill, important in the development of the Classical theory. As a critic he erected into law and dogma the analysed tendencies of the different literary types. Literature is thus treated as a science rather than an art, the individual genius of the great author is left in the background, and it is assumed that, by the study of rules drawn from the works of the master, one can become a poet.

CHAPTER IV

THE LITERARY IDEALS OF SOCIETY. THEIR EXAGGERATIONS

CRITICS from Voltaire to Brunetière have dwelt upon the "social" quality of French literature, its tendency to come from the contact of mind with mind and wit with wit, rather than from the lonely genius, and therefore to be at its best where the intellects of men and women meet. It is no less a commonplace to point out the tremendous influence women have had in French literature. The poetry of courtly love in the Middle Ages, and that of Platonic love in the sixteenth century, were much more definitely modelled by women than through the vague raptures of a poet singing to his mistress. In the eighteenth century the *salons* are all powerful. In the seventeenth century women exercise almost as definite a sway. Even when the two sexes keep apart, the French tendency toward a grouping of talents and of common interests is striking, and the annals of French literary history are sprinkled with the names of schools, coteries, and cliques.

In the seventeenth century the convergent tendency is shown as strongly as ever. The universalising of the literary spirit and the diminution of the individual element, for the sake of the more impersonal one approved by a general "reason" or a common "good sense," could but be fostered by social intercourse. Mlle de Scudéry is quoted as saying: "Les plus honnêtes femmes du monde, quand elles sont un grand nombre ensemble ne disent jamais rien qui vaille, et s'ennuient plus que si elles étaient seules. . . . Au contraire, il y a je ne sais quoi, que je ne sais comment exprimer, qui fait qu'un honnête homme réjouit

et divertit plus une compagnie de dames, que la plus honnête femme du monde ne saurait le faire." To this modest statement of Mlle de Scudéry on behalf of her sex it may be rejoined that, however influential the group of men gathered about Richelieu at the Palais-Cardinal or in the new Academy, these coteries had their greatest charm when presided over by a talented woman like Mme de Rambouillet or Mlle de Scudéry herself.

Mme des Loges (1584–1641) was about the first to open a literary *salon* in Paris, as Mme des Roches had done at Poitiers in the sixteenth century. But Richelieu objected to the meetings at the house of a zealous Protestant, and she left the capital in 1629. Mme de Rambouillet has won infinitely more fame.

The marquise de Rambouillet (1588–1665) was a prominent lady of society, whose delicate health made her unable to put up with the coarse pleasures of a nobility largely trained in the traditions of the civil wars and the boisterousness dear to Henry IV. Her fastidiousness was shocked as well. She resolved, therefore, to withdraw from participation in the busy world, and to draw about her friends of refinement in sympathy with her own tastes and, above all, intellectual people. In order to provide a place of meeting she remodelled her town residence in the rue Saint-Thomas-du-Louvre, and there, from the end of the first decade of the century, she welcomed people of talent, regardless of their rank and fortune. The staircase of the building was set more in the middle of the house than was customary in the architecture of those days, and it admitted one to various nooks and small rooms which facilitated the breaking up of a large company into informal circles. The hostess, as was the frequent custom then, received her friends reclining upon the bed in her own room, which in this case was decorated with blue draperies, and admitted the more favored friends to sit in the *ruelle* or space between the bed and the wall. As it became fashionable for gentlemen and ladies in the literary set to replace their names by a more fanciful and fantastic nomenclature in

order to get away from the prosaic everyday world, Mme de Rambouillet was called Arthénice, an anagram of her name Catherine. These explanations are necessary to make us understand the numerous allusions to the "chambre bleue d'Arthénice," and when we hear of *réduits*, *alcôves*, *ruelles*, and *ronds littéraires*, we have names for the *salons* of which Mme de Rambouillet's was the chief, and in the *alcôvistes* and *coureurs de ruelles* we recognise the confirmed frequenters of society.

In these gatherings, of which the Hôtel de Rambouillet is probably as much an example as a cause, people spent their time in refined and witty conversation. It was necessary to be clever and graceful in language and demeanor. A constant topic was love in its various forms; but, inasmuch as love was conceived not as a *grande passion*, but as a refined and quintessentiated sentiment, eternal indeed in duration, but finding vent in harmless *soupirs* and *flammes*, it may be seen how love could always be discussed, though with a monotonous sameness. The sentimental guide was d'Urfé's *Astrée*, of which the successive parts appeared at intervals of several years, and in the hero and heroine of which society saw the patterns of perfect lovers. In this way the ideal of the gentleman, which even in Balzac's hero has a certain aloofness, is softened, and the *honnête homme* becomes at the same time a *galant homme*.

A list of the habitués of the Hôtel de Rambouillet would be an almost exhaustive catalogue of the intellectual people of the day. Mere courtiers were neglected and took it out in laughing at Mme de Rambouillet's "follies." Others found reputation there more than elsewhere. During the long history of the Hôtel one saw there Richelieu, Chapelain, Malherbe, and Racan, Balzac and Corneille when they came to Paris, Conrart and Vaugelas, the novelist Gombauld, the poets Godeau and Georges de Scudéry, the gossip Tallemant, the epigrammatist Cotin. Among the ladies was Mme de Rambouillet's daughter Julie d'Angennes, for whom the marquis de Montausier sighed for

hirteen years before he won her and to whom he addressed on ne of her birthdays the *Guirlande de Julie*, a garland of poems n different flowers by various poets. There were also, among thers, Mlle de Scudéry, who soon ruled a *salon* of her own, and Mlle Paulet, "la belle lionne," so called for her magnificent nane of tawny hair. When the Neapolitan poet and adventurer Marino came to Paris in 1615 at the invitation of Marie de Médicis and of Concini, he found respite from the composition of the *Adone* by radiating his wit and "conceits" upon the *cercle* of Mme de Rambouillet, until the fall of Concini and the coming of Luynes changed matters and he returned to Italy.

It is customary to divide the history of the Hôtel de Rambouillet into three periods the dates of which must by no means be held rigidly. The first stretches from about 1618, when the *bel air* really began to take the direction of Mme de Rambouillet's house, to the end of the first quarter of the century. The second stage up to the time of Julie's marriage in 1648 was the period of greatest magnificence; the third covered the days of Mme de Rambouillet's old age and decline until her death.

So far it has been possible to speak of Mme de Rambouillet's circle without mentioning the deformation of taste called "preciosity" which is so often linked with its name. The Hôtel de Rambouillet was not, in truth, the home of preciosity in the sense which Molière laughed at, though the tendencies led thereto. In the earlier years the aims of the marquise and her friends were entirely praiseworthy. But people who began with a wish to "débrutaliser" language and manners ended by over-refinement. They wished to improve expressions and fell into the quest for expressions as an aim in itself. This was a tendency which all great languages have undergone at different times, and the preciosity of France is constantly compared, though with distinctions, to English euphuism, Spanish gongorism, and Italian marinism. The process is shown by the history of the word *précieux* itself, which originally had a good meaning like the

English "exquisite" and then degenerated into an "affected exquisite." In English a "precious stone" is very different from a "precious rascal," and the very word "precious" was dear to the modern representatives of preciosity, the æsthetes of the early eighties.

The tendencies of preciosity in France were twofold. At first the desire was to avoid anything common or vulgar or even commonplace, and a chair was called "la commodité de la conversation." Then the mere pursuit of the substitute became an end in itself, and the true name was necessarily replaced by a substitute or a paraphrase as a matter of course. The result was sometimes less pleasing, and a glass of water became a "bain intérieur." M. Brunetière pointed out that the language of preciosity was somewhat akin in its processes of substitution to the vocabulary of slang; but we must remember that preciosity at least wishes for a noble substitute. Many of the figures of speech of preciosity have, indeed, become part and parcel of French,[1] and in Molière's comedies even there were as many new-fangled expressions, not recognized as such today through familiarity, as there are ridiculous preciosities.

The true précieux wanted to scintillate and to surprise by his cleverness at each unexpected turn. Hence his most frequent device was the *pointe*, an intellectual play upon thought, though not necessarily an actual pun. When the writer became conscious of his trick and carried it to the point of revelling in his own inventions for mere fun's sake and without any ulterior motive except satire, we come upon the methods of "burlesque." The copious burlesque literature of the early seventeenth century, as Brunetière also points out, is an offshoot of preciosity rather than its enemy or reaction from it.

The habit of social intercourse of which the Hôtel de Ram-

[1] Such as "châtier son style," "briller dans la conversation." Preciosity helped to improve spelling by cutting out redundant letters of the sixteenth-century grammarians.

bouillet is the type became prevalent, and every lady who thought herself "du beau monde" or "en passe de l'être" tried to form a *salon* and manage a minor Hôtel de Rambouillet. Mme de Sablé did so, but especially Madeleine de Scudéry (1607–1701) whose Saturday gatherings, over which she presided under the name of Sappho ("les samedis de Sapho"), aimed at being even a little more literary than those of Mme de Rambouillet, but were somewhat less distinguished in tone, more *bourgeois*, and distinctly more précieux. This worthy lady, whose life took in the birth and death of Molière, La Fontaine, Pascal, Racine, and La Bruyère, and whose works were translated into English, German, Italian, Latin, and, it is said, Arabic, had as particular intimates Pellisson, the historian of the Academy, called "Acante" or, because of his ugliness, the "Apollon du samedi," and Godeau, bishop of Vence, the "mage de Sidon." Then there were Conrart or Théodamas, Sarrasin or Polyandre, Ménage, and Cyrano, and among the ladies Madeleine Robineau or Roxane who has risen to a new fame through Rostand's *Cyrano de Bergerac*. These ladies and gentlemen tinged their pastimes with a literary hue, and on the famous *journée des madrigaux* all composed poems, except Isarn, who was thought so clever because he wrote:

> Je pourrais bien faire sans peine
> Quelque fort méchant madrigal,
> Mais pour ne le point faire mal
> Je veux un délai de quinzaine.

The incarnation of the spirit of preciosity is found in the *arbiter elegantiarum*, the unofficial master of ceremonies of the Hôtel de Rambouillet, Vincent Voiture (1598–1648). He was the son of a wine-dealer, without genius, but by his cleverness got on in society. The ladies jested at him and called him "Chiquito," but Voiture was the organiser of all the dances and excursions. Or he would play practical jokes, introduce a bear into Mme de Rambouillet's room, smear his face with

flour and "boo" at the ladies, make love to them, and write half-witty, half-obscene poems about them or adapt foreign conceits, like the following imitation of Lope de Vega:

Ma foi, c'est fait de moi: car Isabeau
M'a conjuré de lui faire un rondeau,
Cela me met en une peine extrême.
Quoi! treize vers, huit en eau, cinq en ème!
Je lui ferais aussitôt un bateau.

En voilà cinq pourtant en un monceau,
Faisons en huit, en invoquant Brodeau,
Et puis mettons par quelque stratagème:
Ma foi, c'est fait.
Si je pouvais encore de mon cerveau
Tirer cinq vers l'ouvrage serait beau.
Mais cependant je suis dedans l'onzième,
Et si je crois que je fais le douzième,
En voilà treize ajustés au niveau:
Ma foi, c'est fait!

Yet Voiture is not really to be sneered at. His poems and particularly his correspondence, at a time when Balzac was beating the bass drum, helped to preserve delicacy of style. His esteem in his own country is shown by the quarrel of the Uranistes and the Jobelins, partisans of the *Uranie* of Voiture and the *Job* of Benserade. All society divided into upholders of these rival trifles, and they even stood for cliques in the political intrigues of the Fronde. Voiture's fame abroad is shown by the epistle of Pope to Mrs. Blount:

Sure to charm all was his peculiar fate,
Who without flatt'ry pleased the Fair and Great;
Still with esteem no less convers'd than read,
With wit well-natured, and with books well-bred:
His heart his mistress and his friend did share,
His time the Muse, the witty and the fair.
Thus wisely careless, innocently gay,
Cheerful he play'd the trifle Life, away;
Till Fate scarce felt his gentle breath supprest,

As smiling infants sport themselves to rest.
Ev'n rival Wits did Voiture's death deplore,
And the gay mourn'd who never mourn'd before;
The truest hearts for Voiture heav'd with sighs,
Voiture was wept by all the brightest eyes:
The Smiles and Loves had died in Voiture's death,
But that forever in his lines they breathe.

CHAPTER V

THE NOVEL. THE EPIC. SATIRE

OF the literary *genres* which marked the seventeenth century the drama was by far the most flourishing. Satire was prolific, but so intermixed with the burlesque and the grotesque that, except in Boileau, we have practically no writers of the Classic standard. The epic was abundant but valueless. The novel, on the other hand, which as a modern type escapes the observation of the lawmakers, is at least historically, if not intrinsically, of the greatest interest. It shares too, in the ideal and the burlesque strain, but throughout the first half of the century it is quite non-Classical.

The length of the romances is, according to our notions, appalling. The tale is one of troubled love, wherein the sentimental pride or hesitation of hero or heroine are often the chief obstacle to a union for which, by rank and identity of feeling, the youths are fitted. Consequently the reader is treated to conversations and disquisitions on all kinds of love: passionate, tender, faithful, jealous, and what not. Usually it was the sentimental *galanterie* which appealed to the good society of the day, where it spread through the success of d'Urfé's tender novel *Astrée*. The period described was legendary or semi-historical and the plot was interspersed with subsidiary episodes, conversations, discussions, poems, letters, and word-portraits. In *Astrée* the author, through imitation of the methods of his Italian precursors, stops the narrative upon the arrival of each new character to relate his entire biography up to that point. In the romances of Mlle de Scudéry we are treated to those madrigals, enigmas, *bouts-rimés*, letters, and portraits which are

the butt of Molière's *Précieuses ridicules* and of Boileau's *Héros de roman*. But the novel and society, taken together, throw most interesting light upon the thoughts of polite society in those days.

Says Pierre du Ryer in *les Vendanges de Suresnes:*

> Un homme de néant. . . .
> Pourvu qu'il sache un mot des livres de l'*Astrée*,
> C'est le plus grand esprit de toute la contrée.

This work, the first great modern French novel, was begun in 1607 by Honoré d'Urfé (1567 or 8–1625), but the last parts did not appear until after his death when they were completed by his secretary Balthazar Baro.

D'Urfé was a native of the remote district of Forez toward the centre of France and, like all his contemporaries, travelled in Italy, in the pastoral literature of which country he found one of the chief inspirations of his own romance. For *Astrée* is a compound of the neo-chivalry of the Middle Ages popularised in France by the *Amadis de Gaule* and the stories of Oriane and the *beau ténébreux;* of the Alexandrian pastoral romance renewed by Amyot's translations; and of the modern pastoral such as the Spanish *Diana* of Montemayor, the *Arcadia* of Sannazaro, the *Pastor fido* of Guarini, the *Aminta* of Tasso, even of minor works like writings of Luigi Grotto or the *Filli di Sciro* of Guidubaldo Bonarelli. Contemporaneous with the composition of d'Urfé's novel came the influence of the sugary book of religious love and mysticism, the *Introduction à la vie dévote* of d'Urfé's friend Saint François de Sales. There is no necessary connection of direct influence between the two, but the similarity was realised even in those days, and Camus called *Astrée* the "bréviaire des courtisans" and Saint François's book the "bréviaire des gens de bien."

The scene of d'Urfé's novel is laid in his own Forez country on the banks of the winding Lignon. The period is the fifth century of the Christian era, and we are supposed to move in an

idealised world of shepherds and shepherdesses, of knights and "nymphs," of druids and vestals, whose flutes and ribbons are not to be taken too seriously and in whom it is easy to recognise the people, the nobility, the clergy, and the nuns of the author's own time. There are even keys to the novel and, with more or less imagination, one is at liberty to read into the book the personal experiences of d'Urfé and to see in characters like Euric Henry IV, or in Galathée Marguerite de Valois. The plot relates the faithful and long drawn-out love of the trim young shepherd Céladon for the beautiful and loving, yet proud and jealous shepherdess Astrée and the woes which grew from a misunderstanding. As Céladon is the faithful lover, so Hylas, "l'inconstant Hylas," is the type of the fickle breaker of hearts, and Sylvandre discourses upon Platonic love.

This novel was a godsend to the seventeenth century. It gave writers of plays a rich mine of material from which to draw episodes, it supplied the Hôtel de Rambouillet and polite society with countless problems of love casuistry to discuss. Céladon stood for the embodiment of grace and beauty in the heroes of romance and of the drama for a generation to come, and his name yet lingers in France as that of a light shade of green.

Marin Leroy de Gomberville (1600–1674) or, to give him due honor, Thalassius Basilides a Gombervilla, one of the founders of the Academy, wrote at the period of renewal of interest in military exploits, after the reaction against the warfare of the sixteenth century typefied by the pastoral idyls of *Astrée*, and at the time of explorations in the remote new world. The shepherds of *Astrée* gradually yield in *Carithée* to knights. In *Polexandre* the scenes lie in distant lands; in *la Jeune Alcidiane*, written after Gomberville became a Jansenist, the influence of that sect is to be descried.

The tone of religious morality is to be found in the tales of bishop Camus, of pseudo-history in Desmarets's *Ariane*. But the Gascon Gautier de Coste de la Calprenède (1609 or 10–1663)

was the most famous writer between d'Urfé and Mlle de Scudéry, and in England translations of his *Cassandre*, *Cléopâtre*, and *Faramond* continued their French success until well into the eighteenth century. Richardson's *Pamela* put an end to their vogue.

La Calprenède strengthens the historical romance at the time when Corneille in his tragedies is also turning to history. He cultivates the swashbuckler style associated with the Gascon, and the expression "fier comme Artaban" is used by many a Frenchman today who has never heard of the *Cassandre* in which that proud Persian appears.

The climax of the romantic novel is reached in the works of Mlle de Scudéry to whom her brother Georges lent the credit of his name. *Ibrahim, ou l'Illustre Bassa* turned attention to the Orient which seemed as remote and as imaginary as antiquity. *Artamène, ou le Grand Cyrus* told how the great conqueror of antiquity under the name of Artamène made love to his "belle Mandane," and finally *Clélie* described the tender romance of heroic lovers in the early days of Rome.

The romances of Mlle de Scudéry have a quality of modernity, in that she is supposed to be seeing the deeds of Condé in her novel of *Artamène* and to have meant Condé in describing Cyrus, as well as incidents of the Fronde in *Clélie*. But they reach the climax of preciosity in style, and of artificial *galanterie* in love-making and in the conversation and literary occupations of her characters. The description by Madelon in *les Précieuses ridicules* is no exaggeration of what romance was to Mlle de Scudéry:

> Il faut qu'un amant, pour être agréable, sache débiter les beaux sentiments, pousser le doux, le tendre et le passionné, et que sa recherche soit dans les formes. Premièrement, il doit voir au temple, ou à la promenade, ou dans quelque cérémonie publique, la personne dont il devient amoureux; ou bien être conduit fatalement chez elle par un parent ou un ami, et sortir de là tout rêveur et mélancolique. Il cache un temps sa passion à l'objet aimé, et

cependant lui rend plusieurs visites, où l'on ne manque jamais de mettre sur le tapis une question galante qui exerce les esprits de l'assemblée. Le jour de la déclaration arrive, qui doit se faire ordinairement dans une allée de quelque jardin, tandis que la compagnie s'est un peu éloignée: et cette déclaration est suivie d'un prompt courroux, qui paraît à notre rougeur et qui, pour un temps, bannit l'amant de notre présence. Ensuite il trouve moyen de nous apaiser, de nous accoutumer insensiblement au discours de sa passion, et de tirer de nous cet aveu qui fait tant de peine. Après cela viennent les aventures, les rivaux qui se jettent à la traverse d'une inclination établie, les persécutions des pères, les jalousies conçues sur les fausses apparences, les plaintes, les désespoirs, et tout ce qui s'en suit. Voilà comment les choses se traitent dans les belles manières; et ce sont des règles dont, en bonne galanterie, on ne saurait se dispenser.

The novel of sentimental analysis was badly damaged by the satire of Molière and of Boileau, and the psychological novel of Mme de la Fayette took its place. But there had been almost from the beginning a parallel current of realistic and satirical novels to offset the effect of the romances.

Charles Sorel (1602–1674), whose spirit of satire caused Molière to draw from him in many a play, wrote the *Histoire comique de Francion*, a picaresque novel before *Gil Blas*, as a reaction against the fantastic pastoral taking place in Nowhereland. The action is now in the streets of Paris, the characters are modern Frenchmen, and the scenes occur often in taverns and in places of ill-repute. People like Malherbe, Racan, Balzac, and Mlle de Gournay appear in disguise in the pages. The *Berger extravagant* is a direct parody of the pastoral romance.

Antoine Furetière's *Roman bourgeois* is a realistic story of life among the middle classes and of petty legal bickerings. The *Page disgracié* of Tristan l'Hermite and the works of Cyrano de Bergerac must be mentioned in seventeenth-century fiction. Paul Scarron (1610–1660) wrote many *nouvelles* usually drawn from the Spanish, like *les Hypocrites* which helped Molière in his *Tartuffe*, or *la Précaution inutile* paralleled in l'*Ecole des*

femmes. But his chief work was the *Roman comique*, a narrative of life among travelling actors or "barn-stormers." This story has incorrectly been thought to describe Molière's wanderings through the provinces. But though it deals with a more obscure company, its characters have interesting individualities, and one of them, the townsman Ragotin, has entered the gallery of portraits of French dupes and butts. The book is invaluable in giving a picture of the life of itinerant comedians in the seventeenth century, such as Théophile Gautier tried to make poetical in his romance *le Capitaine Fracasse*. The title, in all probability, was meant by Scarron to signify the "story of actors" or "comedians," and not a "comic story." [1]

The epic *genre* supplies some of the worst examples of seventeenth-century literature. It is, of course, foolish to repeat the hackneyed phrase "les Français n'ont pas la tête épique" when we remember that in the Middle Ages France supplied epic poetry to all Europe. But in the seventeenth century the only form cultivated was the learned epic of the tradition represented by the *Franciade*, though historical rather than purely mythological. The results were as unfortunate. Rules as rigid as for the drama were evolved, drawn from previous writers or inferred from them. Because tragedy was limited in time to a day it became fashionable to bound the epic by a year; in style it had to be rich in episodes and descriptions whether called for or not; in subject-matter it was, at any rate at first, considered an historical or a semi-historical romance in verse with a moral aim, intended to inculcate ethical precepts. This was one of its chief inner differences from the prose romance.

A noteworthy production of epics came about the middle of the century. They were of decidedly unequal length, the more ambitious aiming at Homeric proportions. Georges de Scudéry's *Alaric* was almost a novel of preciosity in verse, with its "festons" and "astragales" which roused Boileau's ire; the *Clovis* of Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin was a semi-chivalric poem; the

[1] So the modern *Histoire comique* of Anatole France.

Pucelle of Chapelain, on Jeanne d'Arc, was versified history; the *Childebrand*, later *Charles Martel*, of Carel de Sainte-Garde made Boileau scold the author in his *Art poétique* as a "poète ignorant," though the latter had the easy retort that "Childebrand" is no more cacophonous than "Achille"; Le Laboureur wrote a long *Charlemagne* and Pellisson an *Eurymédon*. Then there were religious or semi-religious poems by the Père Lemoyne on *Saint Louis*, by Saint-Amant (*Moïse sauvé*), Godeau (*Saint Paul*), Perrault (*Saint Paulin*), and Coras.

It is to be noticed that in nearly all of these poems the Christian religion enters the epic as a component part. The so-called *merveilleux* in the shape of prodigies by allegorical personages, or of magic, or of the supernatural known as the *merveilleux chrétien* were all indiscriminately used as incidents or accidents of the poems.

But in Boileau's *Art poétique* and in the *Traité du poème épique* of the Père Le Bossu (1675) there is a somewhat different attitude toward certain elements of the epic. Boileau suggests nothing to make it more human and even tends to prevent it from touching the feelings by proscribing the *merveilleux chrétien*, perhaps because of the austerity of his Jansenist proclivities. Boileau, too, looks upon the appropriate subject of the epic as fiction or fable rather than history. The epic poem "se soutient par la fable et vit de fiction." The work of the P. Le Bossu is an elaborate treatise in six books, defining the epic "un discours inventé avec art, pour former les mœurs par des instructions déguisées sous les allégories d'une action importante, qui est racontée en vers d'une manière vraisemblable, divertissante et merveilleuse." Hence the divinities, at least, of the story introduced as much allegory as appeared in mediæval works like the *Roman de la Rose*, though they did not bear names as obviously indicating their rôles. The author designates them as *machines*.

Satire in the seventeenth century takes two forms, either the formal Horatian type or the uncouth burlesque. Unfortunately

for the dignity of the *genre* the Horatian satire was marked rather by the grossness of Juvenal, and Regnier was outdone by writers like Courval-Sonnet and Du Lorens. They are, however, almost the only ones deserving mention between Regnier and Boileau.

The burlesque satirists were numerous enough, and their writings show many of the forms of expression belonging to the tavern poets of the libertine set. The leading ones were Scarron and d'Assoucy. Scarron's most famous satirical work was a parody of part of the Æneid, *le Virgile travesti*, in a style thought uproariously funny, but of which the following lines, rendering the passage in the second book in which Æneas begins his narrative to Dido ("Infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem"), may be a sufficient sample for readers of today:

Voyant que la reine obstinée
Prenait plaisir à se brûler,
Et ne pouvait plus reculer,
Il se releva la moustache,
S'ajuste en son lit, tousse, crache,
Puis se voyant bien écouté
Il dit avecque gravité:
"O mon Dieu! la fâcheuse chose
Que votre majesté m'impose!
C'est justement m'égratigner
Un endroit qu'on fera saigner."

CHAPTER VI

THE DRAMA

WITH the plays of Garnier and of Montchrestien the tragedies of the Humanistic tradition cease to be of importance. But the national drama, in spite of the monopoly of the Hôtel de Bourgogne, acquires greater variety and freedom, develops into varied and transformed *genres*, and, before long, other temporary theatres and then a permanent rival one appear.

As early as 1577 the Italian Gelosi had acted in Paris at the Hôtel du Petit-Bourbon. They had as director at the passing of the century Niccolò Barbieri or Beltrame, and a famous and beautiful actress named Isabella Andreini. The Italian comedians, whose sojourns in Paris were at first temporary and not until later permanent, gave plays in their own language and then, as Italian became less familiar in the seventeenth century, in French. They imported or composed specimens of the written comedy, *commedia sostenuta*, and especially of the improvised comedy, *commedia dell'arte*, in which stock characters like the pedant, the pantaloon, the bully, filled in with improvisation and horseplay a plot merely blocked out beforehand. When Molière, during his youth and adolescence, was feeling the dramatic impulse stirring within him it was the comedy of the Italians that fed his hunger. There were Spanish actors off and on during the first half of the seventeenth century, but they were less popular, in spite of the vogue of the Spanish plays as models for French ones.

Other actors came also from the provinces toward the end of the sixteenth century. By 1599 the Confrérie de la Passion,

though still claiming a monopoly, had practically given way to Valleran Lecomte. His organisation, or its lineal successor, with occasional interruptions of several years at a time, became after 1628 the leading Paris company, the *troupe royale*, acting plays of all kinds. With flowery Bellerose and fat Montfleury, the actors, the theatre of the Hôtel de Bourgogne was until the second half of the seventeenth century the great home of the drama.

Another actor-manager known as Mondory, a vigorous and bombastic tragedian, was a rival of the actors of the Hôtel de Bourgogne and out-Heroded Herod so well that once in playing the part in Tristan's *Mariane* he had a stroke of apoplexy. After various provisional abiding-places, and winning success with Corneille's *Mélite*, he established himself at the Théâtre du Marais about 1634. When he had to withdraw, the theatre deteriorated somewhat and was partly devoted to spectacular plays or *pièces à machines*.

In spite of temporary rivals these two theatres were, until the advent of Molière, the two great Paris playhouses. In the early decades of the century Valleran Lecomte had with him a writer of plays named Alexandre Hardy (circa 1570–1631 or 2). This man was a representative of the unhappy class of hired authors who accompanied bands of actors, ranking even lower than they did in social esteem, and for a few pieces of money writing play after play, discarded and destroyed as soon as the vogue was over. It was a sorry occupation for Hardy, obliged to turn out plays by the hundreds, one hardly dares to say how many for only thirty-three remain, and he had no chance to think of literary art. But he did have the opportunity to gain practical experience of stagecraft and to use all material at his command without heed of *a priori* theories. In the plays of Hardy which have survived not a line deserves to stand as literature, but there is much that pleased the audiences of those days. Hardy drew from all sources, and the drama under his touch began to diversify into the great richness which it showed in the early seventeenth century. He sympathised

with the school of Ronsard and in his tragedies tried to turn the *genre* cultivated by the Humanists into acting plays by cutting out the choruses and intensifying the action. He showed himself friendly, within bounds, to the very language of the Pléiade and indirectly drew from antiquity.

When the literary drama of the first half of the seventeenth century is in the full tide of success it is differentiated into four kinds: tragedy, tragi-comedy, comedy, and pastoral, and for some years the pastoral is the favorite of them all. Racan's *Bergeries* and plays by Mairet, Isaac du Ryer, Nicolas Chrestien, Baro, Rayssiguier, Pierre Troterel, and Antoine Maréchal all testify to its fame, either before the vogue of *Astrée* had made itself fully felt or during its fame. There was a hybrid *genre* called *tragi-comédie pastorale*. Beyond these divisions the riotous farce and half-acrobatic comedy were no less popular in the horseplay of Turlupin and his *Turlupinades*, or of Gautier Garguille, Guillot Gorju, and Gros Guillaume turning somersaults with their faces smeared with flour, or in the exhibitions of Tabarin called *Tabarinades* in the booths by the Pont-Neuf.

Finally, the opera and the ballet, of which so much is heard in the second half of the seventeenth century, antedate that time. There had been composite performances of dance and music under the Italianised court of the Valois dynasty in the sixteenth century. Mazarin, with his Italian proclivities, gave the *Finta Pazza* at the Petit-Bourbon in 1645 and afterward the *Orfeo* and the *Ercole amante*. The ballet was much in favor during the reign of Louis XIV and the vogue of Molière, and the king himself used to dance until he thought it too histrionic and Nero-like.

This variety of dramatic expression shows that the French stage in the seventeenth century was far from being narrow and confined. Under the days of the Classical school of 1660 the tragi-comedy and pastoral, it is true, disappear, but even then the opera and spectacular play and the comedy of the Italians share the stage with the tragedy bare of song and of stage-setting.

The simplification of the drama, often considered as depending merely upon theoretical writings, was not without its practical side. It will be remembered that the Hôtel de Bourgogne had inherited the old traditions of the multiple or simultaneous stage-setting of the Middle Ages, in which several places were shown at once. In the comparatively restricted stage-area it became necessary not only to reduce the number of places represented, but, even then, the spectator by a convention was obliged mentally to choose the portion of the background suited to the part of the play being acted. This led to an unconscious desire for simplification by means of the unity or vagueness of place, and the unity of time could grow up too. The ready acceptance of the new rules was a concrete formulation of this feeling.

The new dramatic theorists are Scudéry, La Mesnardière, the Academy, and especially Chapelain and the abbé d'Aubignac. The definition of tragedy given by Scaliger and quoted in a previous chapter still subsists, though it has come down less by direct influence than by the teachings of the Dutchmen Heinsius and Vossius. The former's *De constitutione tragoediae* of 1611 was admired by all who studied the stage.

It was Chapelain who, according to Pellisson, one day enunciated to a surprised group of listeners, including Richelieu, the theory of the unities. This doctrine, which was no new thing, had, however, all the unexpectedness of a new invention. Chapelain in his teachings also dogmatised on the aims and divisions of dramatic poetry. It has as goal the imitation of human actions; its necessary condition is verisimilitude or *vraisemblance;* its perfection is to arouse admiration or *merveille:*

In tragedy the poet imitates the deeds of the great who, without being too good or too bad, come to an unhappy end.

In comedy he shows people of lowly or of moderate station who meet with a happy fate.

Tragi-comedy is a tragedy with a happy ending.

The pastoral, an invention of the Italians and a development

of the eclogue, is a sort of tragi-comedy imitating the deeds of shepherds, but in a loftier mood and with nobler sentiments than is appropriate in the eclogue.

A play should properly consist of three parts: the *commencement*, the *embrouillement*, the *développement*, and the spectator must be kept in suspense from the beginning to the end. Of the five acts, the first initiates us to the characters; the second gives the rise of the trouble; in the third the plot thickens; in the fourth things verge toward despair; in the fifth the plot is resolved unexpectedly but with *vraisemblance*, whence result admiration and wonder.

François Hédelin, abbé d'Aubignac (1604–1676), was a cantankerous critic with a scholastic logic-chopping disposition. In his *Pratique du théâtre*, partly written by 1640, but not published until 1657, he undertook to set forth in detail all the possible characteristics of a play. His dogmatism led him to enunciate all his statements as precepts and laws, whether or not based on broad observation by himself and his predecessors. His rules are all the expression of "Reason," and he does not hesitate to condemn even the greatest of the ancients when he finds them at variance with what he takes reason to be.

The more constructive part of the abbé d'Aubignac's criticism deals with *vraisemblance* which involves the theories of the unities of time and place. *Vraisemblance* is conformity with the feelings of the spectators and is of two kinds: action and representation. By the first the poet must make his subject harmonise with the customs of his audience, even at the risk of violating historical truth and local coloring; by the second the sentiments and the actual sensations of the audience were to be reconciled. The action was not to last much longer, nor extend over much more space, than could be actually observed in the time of representation. Just how great the actual time and space could be was not so easy to determine. It was a mere irritation to an author like Corneille to say that the scene must not pass beyond "l'espace dans lequel une vue commune peut

voir un homme marcher," and to assert that the "revolution of the sun" to which, according to Aristotle, tragedy *tries* to conform, *must* be twelve hours was a gratuitous assumption. But a poet like Racine, who presents a concentrated psychological crisis as plot, will often be able to assume an even briefer extent of time.

Regular tragedy is first represented by a work of Jean de Mairet (1604–1686), who stands for the rules in opposition to the irregular drama by Hardy or of plays like Théophile's *Pirame et Thisbé*. Mairet is an example of what may be called the "sudden blossomer," who wins a few victories when young and is never again able to come up to his reputation. When a mere stripling he drew from d'Urfé's *Astrée* material for *Chrysélide et Arimant*. This was followed by *Sylvie* and then by *Silvanire*, both *tragi-comédies pastorales* and the latter accompanied by a preface dealing with the new theories, which Corneille says induced him to write his *Clitandre* in accordance with the rules. After the comedy *les Galanteries du duc d'Ossonne* there finally came in 1634 the famous *Sophonisbe*. This tragedy has to the modern reader scarcely any intrinsic merit and is of importance merely chronologically as the first concrete example of the new school.

The regular drama was fostered by Richelieu, who was always endeavoring to make his power felt in literature and who had itchings for authorship. He patronised particularly the new Théâtre du Marais, where tragedy tried to rival the irregular drama under the favor of the king at the Hôtel de Bourgogne. He chose as sub-Mæcenas and director of patronage the abbé de Boisrobert, more a playwright than a priest and author of the comedy *la Belle Plaideuse*. He annexed a group of five authors, Boisrobert, Corneille, l'Estoile, Colletet, Rotrou, among whom Corneille soon showed too much independence of taste to succeed, in order to write out the dramas like *la Comédie des Tuileries* and *l'Aveugle de Smyrne* which he planned. Finally, he centred all his hopes on the costly production of

his own *Mirame*, in which he was helped by Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin and for which he built a new hall at the Palais-Cardinal, where he led the applause of the play.

The most famous writers of tragedies, though they did not confine themselves to this *genre* alone, were Pierre du Ryer (1606–1658), author of *Lucrèce*, *Alcyonée*, *Saül*, *Esther*, and *Scévole;* Georges de Scudéry (1601–1667), author of *la Mort de César* and *Didon;* Tristan l'Hermite (1601–1655), author of *Mariane*, *la Mort de Sénèque*, and *la Mort de Crispe*.

In comedy the seventeenth century has not much to brag of before Molière. At first few in number, the plays increase in quantity about 1640. Such as there are show the influence of Spain as well as of Italy, and antiquity is for a time in abeyance. The plays are elaborations of intrigue, without any understanding of character-drawing, though the familiar types appear in the parasite; the pedant; the doting old man; the intriguing woman or *maquerelle;* the nurse, soon to be a *suivante;* the valet, a compound of the Latin slave, the Italian servant, and the Spanish *criado* and *gracioso;* the boaster, a descendant of the *miles gloriosus* and a kinsman of Rodomont and of the capitano Spavento, or of the Gascon swashbuckler like d'Aubigné's baron de Fœneste and La Calprenède's Artaban or the d'Artagnan and Cyrano of Dumas and Rostand. The capitaine Fracasse thundered at the Hôtel de Bourgogne, and Matamore, the slayer of Moors, strode the boards at the Théâtre du Marais.

The plays themselves were often indecent in the extreme, and Mairet's *Galanteries du duc d'Ossonne* was as broad as a modern French vaudeville. D'Ouville, a brother of Boisrobert, was one of the first to draw from Spanish sources; Cyrano de Bergerac's *Pédant joué* has the merit of actual portraiture; Rotrou kept up the classical traditions in his adaptations from Plautus; Thomas Corneille and Boisrobert remodelled Spanish plays and at times came into competition, by the use of the same models, with Scarron. This last is the comedy writer whose plays, along with those of Rotrou and the *Visionnaires* of Desmarets de

Saint-Sorlin, can be read with most interest today. Scarron, in his burlesque comedies or parodies, tries as elsewhere to turn to ridicule the heroic business which he thought overdone in the serious plays. He replaces the grand style of tragedy by mock-heroics and transforms its action into horseplay. In this he was helped by the low comedian Jodelet, who was soon to contribute to the success of Molière's *Précieuses* and for whom Scarron wrote several plays adapted to Jodelet's long and lank stature, his nasal voice, and his flour-smeared face. Jodelet, like a thin Sancho Panza, plays the coward's part, bringing discredit on nobility of character, turning it to ridicule by his baseness. In *Jodelet, ou le maître valet* Scarron contributes to the type of the French valet, of whom Molière gives greater examples in Mascarille or Scapin, and who becomes the Crispin of the eighteenth century; in *Jodelet duelliste* the *soufflet* of the *Cid* is parodied; in *Don Japhet d'Arménie* the foolish anti-hero constantly finds himself in scrapes, deceived by people, ducked with dirty water, or left hanging in the air when out love-making. It has been noticed that Scarron's grotesqueness is somewhat like one element of modern Romanticism. Hugo, of course, thought that the grotesque was an essential element of the drama, and don César de Bazan is like a hero of Scarron with redeeming qualities. In language, too, there is occasionally a slapdash vigor about Scarron which recalls the Romantic *panache*.

Desmarets's comedy *les Visionnaires* has practically no plot, but is a capital portrayal of fantastic characters or "humors." It is interesting for its types, which are more original than in most of the comedies of the time, and for the literary material which it contains. We see in it not only the traditional *capitan*, but the crazy poet repeating the language of the Pléiade, the précieuse in love with a hero from history like Alexander the Great, the lady who thinks all men in love with her (prototype of Molière's Bélise in *les Femmes savantes*), and the one who dotes on the play, and discusses the unities.

Tragedy and comedy are the two types destined for success. The pastoral, after a brief and brilliant career of glory, is swept away as irregular.

The pastoral play in its origins is connected, not only with the Italian and Spanish romances already discussed in another chapter, but with the semi-dramatic dialogues and pastoral eclogues composed for reading as well as acting. It gradually grew more important and reached some vogue in the provinces, probably before it did in Paris, which in the sixteenth century and in the transition years to the seventeenth was often behind other great French towns. It is really not until the establishment in Paris of Valleran Lecomte's company of provincial players that the pastoral comes much into vogue and that Hardy composes some, among the multitudinous *genres* which he cultivates. It takes for itself pre-eminently the love plot, as differentiated from the subject of tragedy borrowed from ancient history or mythology, from that of comedy based upon the Italian and then the Spanish intrigue, and from the tragi-comedy of wild adventure. The subject of a pastoral usually showed a series of characters of whom A loved B, B loved C, C loved D, and so on. There were stock rôles of shepherds, shepherdesses, the magician, the satyr; there were stock literary commonplaces, such as the praise of the country, the welcome of spring, the pleasures of the hunt, the eulogy of the golden age; there were traditional narratives and episodes, including the echo song, oracles, the discovery of long-lost children, disguises, and metamorphoses. The pastoral, because of its thorough modernity and its lack of prototypes in antiquity, was at first free from the constraint of the rules. Later, with the growth of Classicism, the authors of pastorals readily accepted the unities to show themselves up to date. But this was almost coincident with the disappearance of the largely lyrical *genre* in an age turning in its best writers to realism and psychological analysis.

As in so many circumstances Hardy, though no real man of letters, helped the development of the pastoral, giving in his

own productions vigor and dramatic movement to a type which had been undecided and wavering. Similarly d'Urfé in his *Astrée*, a novel, it is true, but belonging in every way to the pastoral school, made literary form and expression necessary considerations. The result, indirect quite as much as direct, is seen in such a work as Racan's *Bergeries*, published in 1625, which is the starting-point in the production of the pastorals of the best period. It is to this period that belong Mairet's *Sylvie*, published in 1628, and his *Silvanire*, published in 1631, with its preface on regularity in the drama, and the *Amaranthe* of Gombauld, published in 1631.

In spite of its monotony to us the pastoral play satisfied by its romance the idealists in literature. Moreover, at the period when the comedy of the Renaissance had lapsed and the new comedy was not yet vigorous, it not only bridged the gap, but helped to introduce sentiment in place of the lewdness of the old Italianate comedy of the Humanists. All the new writers did not take the lesson, but Corneille and Rotrou did, and *Mélite* is practically a pastoral play of love in a seventeenth-century setting.

When the pastoral disappeared as a *genre* its elements of adventure tended to merge in the tragi-comedy, which lasted for some years longer. Its purely pastoral elements of shepherd song or love-duet passed into the pastoral ballets and *intermèdes*, of which we have examples even in Molière, and supplied plots to the newly developing opera.

The tragi-comedy, though its name has become as archaic as that of the pastoral, has closer modern equivalents, and the Romantic drama and *comédie héroïque* have often elements which were to be found in the old *genre*. The tragi-comedy was vague in content, and the definition as a play presenting kings and princes and with a happy ending did not account for the possible varieties, in which there was mixture of tragic and comic elements, or in which tragic action occurred among people of low estate.

The tragi-comedy was still more than the pastoral at liberty to select a subject at random from popular stories or Spanish plays, and the plots vied with the novels in complexity and multifariousness of incident. Sometimes they were prolonged into *journées* like the Spanish *jornadas*, representing wide space and time. In this and in other ways the tragi-comedy continued the laicised mystery-plays of the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and it is the most direct popular successor of the mediæval *genres*.

The tragi-comedy is found as a name in the modern theatre as early as the middle of the sixteenth century: the first important example is the *Bradamante* of Garnier in 1580, the first author to cultivate it frequently and with success was as usual Hardy, and François Ogier's preface to Jean de Schelandre's *Tyr et Sidon* was a declaration in favor of the liberty that the tragi-comedy required. The period of greatest success of the tragi-comedy was between about 1628 and 1648, and then came its disintegration and disappearance during the next quarter of a century. It had to contend against the levelling and unifying influence of Richelieu and the Academy as expressed by the rules, and it was this influence which frightened Corneille into changing the title of the *Cid* from tragi-comedy to tragedy and prevented him from using the name in later plays. But it had noted representatives in Georges de Scudéry and Jean de Schelandre, who in 1628 rewrote and turned into a tragi-comedy his *Tyr et Sidon*, originally published as a tragedy in 1608, and it had an illustrious representative in Jean Rotrou, who wrote a number of tragi-comedies among his varied dramatic compositions.

The tragi-comedy disappeared as a separate *genre* for various reasons. Its liberty seemed licence to the partisans of regularity. So it was either neglected entirely, or it lost much of its *raison d'être* by being regularised and brought nearer to tragedy. Finally, certain writers like Corneille, himself restless under the drastic divisions laid down by the rules, wrote plays such as *Cinna* and *Nicomède*, tragedies in all respects by the treatment

of plot and psychological character studies, but which did not have an unhappy ending. What was good in the tragi-comedy was taken over, and the purely imaginative or romantic element fell out of fashion in the drama as elsewhere. So the name, at least, gradually disappeared.

The first half of the seventeenth century was, in the drama as in other literary *genres*, essentially what would today be called a romantic age, though the French language expresses the idea more accurately by the word *romanesque* opposed to *romantique*. In this way we understand the tremendous vogue of the pastoral play and of the tragi-comedy as well as the general Spanish fashion in the drama. Corneille, during the period of his success, is always struggling to reconcile his poetic fancy with the galling fetters of the growing rules. Aside from Racine, the perfection of whose genius has caused him to be looked upon as more typical than he really was, the secondary writers tend to remain, within the bounds of the unities, *romanesques* and only partly Classical. Moreover, though forgotten today, they sometimes won victories as great as that of *le Cid* or of *Andromaque*. The greatest play of the whole century, from the point of view of popular success, was *Timocrate* in 1656, by Thomas Corneille (1625–1709), the younger brother of Pierre Corneille. This author is, indeed, better than his brother or than Racine an example of the average qualities which win immediate but not enduring fame. Thomas Corneille followed the fashions instead of guiding them, and taking in turn as models the successes of Pierre Corneille in his *Timocrate*, *Bérénice*, *Camma*, *Stilicon*, or *Laodice*, and of Racine in his *Ariane*, he fashioned them with the preciosity of language which Molière hated and with the heroic-romantic plot current in the successful novels and even in some plays of Pierre. In justice to Thomas Corneille it should be added that in *le Comte d'Essex*, though he still imitates his brother, he does write an historical drama which has its own value.

The recurring plot of the popular tragedy, as turned out by

Thomas Corneille and the writers of his class until well into the second half of the century, centres on the concealed birth of the young hero who, though brave, victorious, and handsome, thinks his love for his beautiful princess hopeless until the mystery of his birth is unexpectedly revealed and he ascends the throne in triumph. In *Bérénice* the hero passes through four rôles in one day. The heroine is no less beautiful and haughty, weighing love against pride, but emotional and inevitably falling a victim to the hero's wooing. This sort of a plot is complicated by intercepted letters and portraits, jealous rivals, rebellions and mutinies quelled in a twinkling by the brave hero.

CHAPTER VII

CORNEILLE. ROTROU

PIERRE CORNEILLE (1606–1684) was born at Rouen in Normandy, and was all his life a good example of the qualities of his race and training, showing even in his writings many tendencies which characterise one springing from a *famille de robe*, or legal family, of one who had been a pupil of the Jesuits and had himself studied law. In his uneventful, even rather gloomy life spent partly in Rouen, partly in Paris, Corneille remained a sedate *bourgeois*. He was a pious churchwarden, ill at ease in society and clumsy in handling the phrases of courtesy and flattery, once making himself ridiculous by the fulsome eulogy of his dedication of *Cinna* to the dishonest financier Montauron. One or two touches of romantic sentiment are shown by his verses to the actress Mlle du Parc, of Molière's company, who scoffed at his middle-aged admiration. His old age was saddened by some financial difficulties, though stories such as that of his waiting at the cobbler's until his one pair of shoes could be repaired have no foundation in fact. He was elected late in life to the Academy, and already saw himself distanced in popularity by Racine, a rival young enough to be his son.

Yet Corneille need not fear comparison with any dramatic author in French literature, and to a good many people today his tragedies are more attractive than those of Racine. His plays are not such subtle psychological studies as those of the younger poet; the language is a little more rough and uncouth, for he belongs to an older generation and does not have the smoothness and polish of the full French Classicism. But in the

vigor and imagination of his plots, the strong heroic characters he was fond of portraying, the sonorousness of his rhetoric, Corneille expresses the turmoil and romance of his days, and is likely to appeal to a modern age surfeited with psychological analysis.

Corneille, it will be observed, wrote his masterpieces during the romantic days of the earlier seventeenth century, when French greatness was being moulded by the violence of Richelieu and the crafty vigor of Mazarin. It was an age of picturesque adventure on the part of undisciplined noblemen still untamed after the civil wars which had unified France, and of strong-minded heroines. The ideal of the novel might be the faithful and languishing lover, but in the Cornelian drama it was the majestic and great. In no case was it the wavering irresolution of a Hamlet, helpless before a sea of troubles. So the defect of Corneille is sometimes an overstraining of heroism, which tends to make his characters parodies of human nature instead of real men and women.

Corneille does not invent this quality in literature. It comes to him as a result of the Spanish influence which so totally supersedes in tragedy the Italian tradition. Spain was now present everywhere in custom and in costume. In spite of politics and warfare, in spite of ridicule at the Spanish boasting and exaggeration, which has indeed its counter-influence in the burlesque writers, Spain was all-fashionable in the court and society where ruled the Spanish princess Anne of Austria. All people of education knew Spanish, and all the writers of plays, as we have seen, drew from the drama of Spain. Corneille is the chief author whose copying is not a mere *pastiche* and who unites the French drama and the Spanish *comedia*.

The Spanish drama was romantic in the extreme and characterised by its complicated plots and the stress which it laid upon love and honor. Romantic love did not appeal to Corneille, or perhaps the scandal aroused by his portrayal of it in *le Cid*, his chief exception in this respect, caused him, timid as he was, to be

more wary. Certainly his early comedies have anything but fierce passion in the insipid *galanterie* which distinguishes them, in the readiness of lover and loved one to be off with the old and on with the new to suit the exigencies of a five-act play. The complicated plot he does like. In *Clitandre* and the *Illusion comique* he lets himself loose in all kinds of wild devices. In the other early comedies, though he is more realistic, still he likes to mix up the intrigue, a tendency which never leaves him, and of his own plays he prefers the complicated ones. He points out with satisfaction that *Héraclius* must be seen more than once before it can be understood.

In particular Corneille develops the feeling of proud and sensitive honor, the *point d'honneur*. He has to modify it a little in order to make it acceptable to the French, and tone down its primitive fierceness and brutality, which caused the Spanish hero to sacrifice all love and friendship to a cruel idea of honor, of which the chief element was a pride often, according to our views, misdirected. Corneille, accordingly, makes honor somewhat less emotional and passionate, and more in harmony with French rationalism. The honor is reasoned out, and the poet, therefore, emphasises the marked feature of French life of the day, a strong will or *volonté;* for will power is needed to carry out the dictates of reason. It is this effort when overdone which makes the Cornelian hero or heroine untrue to nature, and explains why Horace, Emilie, and Théodore are too superhuman or inhuman to be sympathetic. The characters have, too, an apparently selfish element, which again is less emotional than the Spanish honor, and is sometimes very cold-blooded. This is their *gloire*, a pride of honor which is frequently the result of weighing pros and cons. Horace, in a passage sometimes considered a Cornelian *crux*, when he kills his sister says, "Ma patience à la raison fait place," as though it were through reason that he yields to his fury, and Emilie's *gloire* determines her to kill Augustus, in spite of the years of kind treatment she has received from him.

Thus, the *volonté* in Corneille is an expression of that force of character which marks the age. In the drama it shows itself in a stoical psychology, which is partly literary and classical in its origin, though it coincides in concrete manifestation with the Spanish violence. But in plays such as the *Cid*, *Horace*, *Cinna*, *Polyeucte*, it is directed towards the maintenance of a feeling of duty to which we should not always give moral approbation, and which, as the expression of a person's *gloire*, is very selfish. It has often been pointed out that Corneille's *vertu* is not so much what we call the fulfilment of duty as something akin to the development of character named by the Italians *virtù*.

Another Spanish characteristic with which Corneille is much in sympathy is the swagger and dash of word and deed which the French call *panache*. The exaggerated *hâbleur* is Spanish in source (*hablar*), and Scarron made him ridiculous. But the telling of daring deeds in resounding speech has always appealed to the dramatic side of the French character, which likes this form of the picturesque, as manifesting the boldness, foolhardiness, or pluck called *crânerie*. It is success in achieving a vigorous sweep of sounding words which gives value to the bombast of a drama by Hugo, it is the dramatic picturesqueness of deed which pleases amid the artificialities of Rostand's *Cyrano de Bergerac*. When Charlotte Corday murdered Marat, she had in mind not only the liberators told of in Plutarch, but a heroine like the Emilie of Pierre Corneille, whose collateral descendant she was. And when in her defence she quoted the line of Thomas Corneille, "Le crime fait la honte, et non pas l'échafaud," she was as much guided by the dramatic instinct as the actor John Wilkes Booth exclaiming after his murder, "Sic semper tyrannis."

Notwithstanding the boldness of his characters, Corneille himself was timid and sensitive to criticism. They are ready to oppose their will to the whole world, but Corneille in the *discours*, the *préfaces*, and the *examens* with which he afterwards accompanied his plays, is always trying to reconcile the liberties he has

taken or his unconscious violation of the rules before he knew them, with the pronunciamentos of the dogmatists. In many respects the theoretic writings of Corneille are a reply to the charges of such a critic as the abbé d'Aubignac. Corneille, with his fondness for complicated plots, found the unities a great hindrance and was always endeavoring to escape these conventions by means of other conventions. He began, moreover, to write at a time when the simultaneous stage-setting was in vogue and thus found difficulty in the *ex post facto* introduction of a unity of place. The complication of action and the many things his characters had to do made the narrow limit of time particularly galling. Corneille never found it easy to fall in with the technicalities of Classical theory. For this reason he is constantly hedging or suggesting conventions to get round the difficulty. In the *Cid*, as his own contemporaries pointed out, the hero has to cram three years of action into twenty-four hours and has to work through the night to do so. As to place, Corneille would like to assume as unity the confines of a whole city, like the convention of the Italian comedy of a street on which the houses open, or a vague and indeterminate time and place, "une chambre à quatre portes"; which is merely getting rid of the difficulty by a conjurer's trick. Except by some such straining of facts we cannot deny that the action of *le Cid* takes place in no less than four different places. In *Cinna*, Emilie ought certainly to do her conspiring out of Augustus's hearing, and the Cornelian convention causes both of them to come forth from their own rooms to utter their confidences in the public passage between.

Corneille has a good deal to say in his writings concerning the aims and use of tragedy, which should be both pleasing and useful by its MORAL INSTRUCTIONS, its portrayal of virtue and vice and their consequences, and its effect in purging the passions through pity and fear. But his efforts to bring Aristotle up to date, as an answer to his critics, are much less important in determining his development than the famous dispute over the

Cid, which hurt his sensibilities so much and affected the composition of his later masterpieces.

Corneille began to write plays casually and without theorising. He afterwards called his early comedies "des péchés de jeunesse" and "des coups d'essai d'une muse de province," and critics of the conventional Classic tradition in later generations neglected them. This is unjust: they are not particularly interesting reading today, but they mark a great advance over contemporary plays; and by grouping them with *le Menteur* we are justified in saying that Corneille is as important in the history of comedy as in that of tragedy. It is he who gives us the comedy of manners and the beginning of the character-comedy. He is, however, as fond here as in his tragedies of the involved plot.

The first play *Mélite*, acted at Rouen in 1629, was brought to Paris by Mondory and won a great success. It was said to have been based on an actual incident witnessed by Corneille and the plot turned on the misunderstandings of lovers misled by false letters. The play was novel in that it avoided the current obscenity and strove to win its effects by portraying the life of the day. The love depicted is but a polite gallantry, and the style inclines in a marked degree towards preciosity. The play is quite inconsistent with the rules, which Corneille acknowledges he did not then know.

Before the next play, *Clitandre* (1632), a tragi-comedy, Corneille had learned of them. In a most complicated work showing the beginnings of the Spanish influence, he undertook to write a play which should be regular according to the rules, but otherwise worthless, "in which endeavor" he adds, "I succeeded perfectly." It was followed in quick succession during the next few years by *la Veuve*, *la Galerie du Palais*, *la Suivante*, and *la Place Royale*. These comedies were full of the same fashionable insipid love as *Mélite*, and the titles of two of them show their realism. The audiences were captivated at seeing incidents take place before the booths of the merchants, booksellers, and

linen-drapers at the Palais de Justice, or in a public resort for gentility like the Place Royale. Corneille wrote part of the *Comédie des Tuileries*, which was followed by his first tragedy, *Médée*, in which may be already descried the bravura of Cornelian rhetoric. The year 1636 saw the *Illusion comique* and the *Cid*, unless the latter belongs to the beginning of 1637.

The *Cid* is roughly classed among tragedies, inasmuch as its own category has disappeared. But to Corneille it was a tragi-comedy. He took the career of a half-legendary Spanish hero, as last depicted in Guillén de Castro's drama *Las Mocedades del Cid* and turned it into a concentrated French play, portraying the love of Rodrigue and of Chimène, and turning on the consequences of the insult which Chimène's father gives to the father of Rodrigue. There is a certain similarity with the position of Romeo and of Juliet between the two hostile houses, but the impelling forces of each character are more plainly defined. Instead of the blind sway of passion we witness the conflict of love and honor or duty, in solving which the author has some difficulty in softening a legend of Spanish bloodthirstiness and barbarism to the standard of seventeenth-century drawing-room ideals, in combining in the hero a Céladon and a *malamore*.

To Corneille's contemporaries *le Cid* was not the beginning of a new epoch. It was merely the greatest tragi-comedy yet seen. What captivated the public was not only the romantic spirit from Spain, but the author's vast improvements in style: the play abounds in brilliant epic passages, in tender lyric utterances, in sonorous rhetoric. All Paris, said Boileau, was as much in love with Rodrigue as Chimène was. But Corneille had his jealous rivals and detractors, among them Mairet and Scudéry. Mairet was impotently insolent; Scudéry, egged on perhaps by Richelieu, who may have been jealous of Corneille's success and independence, wrote the *Observations sur le Cid*, in which he accused Corneille of composing a play without sufficient

mystery of plot, violating proprieties of morals and probabilities of action, full of defects of detail and of versification, and where meritorious unoriginal. The quarrel was finally submitted to the newly established Academy for judgment, and in 1638 appeared the *Sentiments* of that body, mainly drawn up by Chapelain. The verdict was a compromise: in some places Corneille was justified, in others Scudéry. But the summing up could not avoid the conclusion that the *Cid* had won deserved success by "la naïveté et la véhémence de ses passions, la force et la délicatesse de plusieurs de ses pensées et cet agrément inexplicable qui se mêle dans tous ses défauts."

Corneille's sensibilities were sadly hurt by this verdict. He waited many months before bringing out *Horace* in 1640. This is one of his most regular and Classical tragedies, and, strangely enough, its only violation of the rules is a possible multiplicity of the sacrosanct unity of action. It shows the effect of the criticism he had received. He again has the difficulty of reconciling a legend of primitive days with modern sentiment and of winning favor for a murderer of his sister. He had not the help of the religious feeling which could excuse to the Greeks the sacrifice of Iphigenia by her father, or to moderns the story of Abraham and Isaac, nor was he writing for the rude seigneurs who could hear unmoved Guillaume, in the poem of *Aliscans*, wishing to kill his sister Blanchefleur. His task was to take repulsiveness from an incident such as Brutus commanding the execution of his son. It must be acknowledged that he succeeded very well. Though he had momentarily turned from Spain he preserved the grandiloquent rhetoric of his previous play, so that the action moves on an epic as well as a tragic plane. Nothing can excel the scene between Horace and Curiace, the narrative of the supposed defeat and the victory, the curses of Camille. The murder of Camille is revolting, but the tirades of Plutarchian stoicism make the barbarous Roman patriot more excusable, and we fail to realise that even young Horace's love of country does yield to his selfish pride. A certain stiffness

of language, a slightly archaic method of expression, not without charm, tend in the same way.

As with *Horace*,

Au *Cid* persécuté *Cinna* dut sa naissance.

Without being so strikingly dramatic as the two previous plays, it marks an additional step towards the external simplicity of the brief Classical action and technical construction, and the inner complication of psychological motivation. The play is more modern, too, than *Horace*. The heroine Emilie seemed to many in the seventeenth century, as she did to Saint-Evremond, the true centre of the play, and was not merely a descendant of the heroine of a Spanish *comedia*, but, in her conspiracy against Augustus, a contemporary of the courageous yet heartless and intriguing women of the incipient Fronde, Mme de Chevreuse or Mme de Longueville. At the same time, like the daughter of Mme de Rambouillet, she makes her lover Cinna wait her beck and call. He, in spite of his passions of ambition, pride, and honor, sighs like a furnace at her feet, languishes for his "belle inhumaine," and is the example of the urbane Roman gentleman, a pattern for the French "honnête homme" that we have seen analysed by Balzac and portrayed in the novels of the day.

The elements of love and will which stand out in *le Cid* and *Cinna* reach the climax of their development in *Polyeucte* (1642 or 1643). This play verges on the ridiculous in the emphasis the author gives to what he is pleased to call "reason" as opposed to feeling, yet he manages after all so well in keeping within bounds, though for the last time, that the drama is in many respects his best, and is certainly one of the most readable today. In language and style it equals *Horace*, it has less bombast than *le Cid*, the psychology is more keen than in *Cinna*. To Corneille's contemporaries who heard him read *Polyeucte* at the Hôtel de Rambouillet it seemed faulty in portraying married love instead of the gallantry of courting and in bringing

upon the stage the mysteries of the Christian faith. There were a number of contemporary religious dramas by La Serre, Du Ryer, Desfontaines, Rotrou, and Baro, not to speak of the Latin plays of the Jesuits, but to a century which on the stage used the word *temple* to avoid saying *église*, the experiment was venturesome. And the imprecations of Stratonice seemed horrible:

> Ce n'est plus cet époux si charmant à vos yeux;
> C'est l'ennemi commun de l'état et des dieux,
> Un méchant, un infâme, un rebelle, un perfide,
> Un traître, un scélérat, un lâche, un parricide,
> Une peste exécrable à tous les gens de bien,
> Un sacrilège impie, en un mot, un chrétien.

The defect of the play to the modern reader lies in the monstrosity of the will power of Polyeucte and Pauline. The seventeenth century even might prefer Sévère as a polished gentleman, a model of good breeding and faithful devotion, the "parfait amant" that Pauline saw in him. The Cornelian grandeur and self-abnegation of Polyeucte's character make him in the face of martyrdom not only crave death but turn over his wife to his rival. Pauline is so constantly harping on her *gloire* and ringing the changes on the phrase "sur mes passions ma raison souveraine," that one does not blame the dauphiness for saying: "Voilà une très honnête femme qui n'aime pas son mari." Yet the play is, after all, one of the most admirable that Corneille wrote. But henceforth defects tend to counterbalance merits in his tragedies: complication of plot and artificiality of character. This criticism does not, however, apply to *la Mort de Pompée*, which is but a series of dialogues and narratives.

Le Menteur, drawn from the Spanish, was the greatest comedy yet written in France. Like Corneille's early compositions, it refrained from farcical horseplay and obscenity; like them it depended upon the portrayal of life and manners in Paris. But in addition it had the element of wit, and in Dorante and his father Géronte two persons whose characters stand out with

some individuality. The hero is a type not unfamiliar to the modern stage, a mixture of boldness and insipidity, with something in him of young Marlowe of *She Stoops to Conquer*, finding it more easy to lie than to tell the truth. The *Suite du Menteur* has the defect of sequels.

Rodogune was one of Corneille's favorite plays, but nowadays, even if we do not share Lessing's criticisms, it reads like a tearing Romantic melodrama, with its array of jealous women, of princely origin veiled in mystery, of goblets of poison. Corneille wrote the play to fit the climax of the last act, a striking one, and the action revolves about the person of Cléopâtre, a sort of Hedda Gabbler or White Devil, who does evil for evil's sake, and in whom the Cornelian *volonté* is transformed to violence. Her chief justification is that the same woman Rodogune had won away her husband's love and is now going to be her daughter-in-law.

The violence of *Rodogune*, though directed to a better cause, is repeated in *Théodore, vierge et martyre*, a religious play brought about by *Polyeucte*. Even the seventeenth century could not put up with Théodore's unwomanly will and pride. In *Héraclius*, more involved in plot than ever, we get one of the best examples of the imbroglio and concealment *motif* so popular in the novel and drama: Prince Héraclius is brought up in concealment as Martian, Martian is thought to be Léonce, and Martian-Léonce, led by mistake to believe himself Héraclius and loving Pulchérie, the sister of the real Héraclius, thinks he cannot marry her because she is his newly found sister. It was of such substitutions that Madelon, in Molière's *Précieuses ridicules*, was thinking when she said: "Je crois que quelque chose un jour me fera voir une naissance plus illustre." Corneille picks out for particular commendation one of the most complicated passages of all as "une des choses les plus spirituelles qui soient sorties de ma plume."

Andromède is a mythological drama accompanied by music and song and spectacular transformation scenes, and is a transi-

tion to the opera. *Don Sanche d'Aragon* is a story of concealed origins like *Héraclius* and the novels: the prince of Aragon is brought up as a lowly fisherman's son, but becoming a famous warrior he wins the love of the queen of Castile and of his own sister the princess of Aragon. To this tragi-comedy Corneille gives the new name of *comédie heroïque*. The play is an excellent example of a Romantic drama, a good one too. There is a slight similarity with the subject of Hugo's *Ruy Blas*, and some of Corneille's contemporaries thought they recognised the loves of the adventurer Mazarin and of Anne of Austria.

Nicomède appeared as a tragedy: we should call it a tragi-comedy, with certain nearly comic features. It is almost the last readable play of Corneille, and was followed in 1652 by *Pertharite*, a failure in the author's own day. Keenly hurt by his disaster, he withdrew from the stage for several years and buried himself mainly with a translation of the *Imitatio Christi*. Then in 1659 he was persuaded to bring out a new play *Œdipe*, which in its time had great vogue but is now forgotten. Of the remaining plays, after *la Toison d'or*, a transformation play, in point of time *Sertorius* is the best (1662). But *Sophonisbe*, *Othon*, *Agésilas*, *Attila*, *Tite et Bérénice*, *Pulchérie*, *Suréna*, though often financially profitable, merely excited the epigrams of Boileau or were cast into the shade by the rising genius of Racine. *Psyché*, in 1671, was a mixed play with songs and ballet written in collaboration with Molière and Quinault.

From this survey of Corneille's career it is evident how little we can class him as a true Classicist. He is far more a type of the romantic age, in the French sense of *romanesque*, during which his best plays were written. He shows in language and construction the progress of his time towards the art of the later seventeenth century, but the Classical mould came to him only as a result of criticism, he was never at his ease within it, his Classical masterpieces are scarcely three or four in number, and the Classical plays of his maturity were the worst he wrote. He began with comedies of preciosity and fashionable *galanterie*, and

tragi-comedies like *Clitandre* or the *Cid*. Even his earliest tragedy, *Médée*, has a turgidness which is Spanish and Senecan as much as Classical. After the *Cid* he tries to make himself "Aristotelian," and the result is *Horace*, *Cinna*, *Polyeucte*, and *Pompée*. But he soon works off into the melodrama of *Rodogune*, the irregular and operatic play like *Andromède*, the tragi-comedy of *Nicomède*, the heroic comedy of *Don Sanche*.

Corneille's portrayal of life is, on the whole, a romantic one. It is true that, except in *le Cid*, he does not make much of passionate love, and his characters differ greatly from the beings of Hugo swayed by passion and fate: "l'amour d'un honnête homme doit toujours être volontaire," he says in the dedication of *la Place Royale*. But in his conception of a plot he was strictly at variance with the Classical ideals and particularly the *vraisemblance* of Chapelain and d'Aubignac. In the preface of *Héraclius* he declares that "le sujet d'une belle tragédie doit ne pas être vraisemblable." He is looking, then, not to depict the general and universal passions of human nature, but rather the exceptional and extraordinary. The reason directing his heroes and heroines, those "captains of their soul," is a superhuman and often unnatural one, which may excite *la merveille* but which belongs rather to the world of fancy and of romance than to reality. Occasionally a Horace or a Théodore, or some characters of his later plays, become an unintentional burlesque of human nature. In a few plays he falls in with the Classical concentration of plot, but that is not his own bias. The greatness of Corneille is in his contrast of conflicting outer and inner forces. They are primary forces on both sides, and his characters are not complex psychological studies, even if occasionally fond of casuistry and legal subtleness. They inspire the reader or spectator with admiration because, though not always *vraisemblables*, they seem heroic, and to the imaginative mind thrilling. It is when by exaggeration or perversion of their greatness their *générosité* or *magnanimitas* is

carried over to selfishness and brutality that Corneille shows deformation.

Above all, the charm of Corneille is in his magnificent rhetoric. He is a master in French literature of heroic verse for narrative, description, imprecation; occasionally, as in *le Cid* and *Polyeucte*, for the lyric and elegiac mood. Tirades such as the monologue of Don Diègue, the narrative of the fight against the Moors, the curses of Camille, are unsurpassed. If Corneille had tried the sustained epic with enough strength of conviction to keep clear from the rules of the allegorical and moralising *genre* he would have accomplished what no other French writer since the Middle Ages could do.

Jean Rotrou (1609–1650) is by far the best writer of tragedies of the seventeenth century next to Corneille and Racine, and the romantic non-Classical quality of his plays makes him appeal, in spite of his remoteness, to those English readers who can understand him. Even his countrymen sometimes call him a French Shakespere. A good portion of his life is still obscure, and he seems to have undergone at certain periods many hardships, including perhaps the ungrateful position of a *poète à gages*, possibly as successor of Hardy at the Hôtel de Bourgogne. After he had come to prosperity, the gallantry of his fate in sticking to his charge at Dreux during an epidemic, which he himself caught and of which he died, has given him a halo of picturesqueness. Rotrou was one of Richelieu's five authors.

Though a few years younger than Corneille, Rotrou is slightly more archaic in expression than his contemporary. He is really the immediate successor of Hardy in the history of the French drama. His numerous plays have not all come down to us: thirty-five are left, consisting of tragedies, tragi-comedies, and comedies. They are drawn from all sources: Classical, Italian, Spanish, even from neo-Latin plays by the Jesuit father Louis Cellot. The first one, a comedy called *l'Hypocondriaque*, probably belonging to 1628, turns partly on the intercepting of letters, followed by madness. This subject Corneille used almost

immediately, perhaps with intentional imitation, in *Mélite*. The second play, *la Bague de l'oubli*, is one of the very first French plays taken from the Spanish. There was mutual appreciation and admiration between Corneille and Rotrou. In Rotrou's *Saint-Genest*, Corneille is spoken of in flattering terms, and it is not unlikely that *Rodogune* has influenced *Venceslas*, (the rivalry of brothers), and that *Cosroès* stands between *Rodogune* and *Héraclius* on the one hand and *Nicomède* on the other: *Cosroès* goes back ultimately to the same source as *Héraclius*, the *Annales ecclesiastici* of Cardinal Baronius, through Cellot, and there are similarities with *Rodogune*. On the other hand, the similarity between *Cosroès* and *Nicomède* is too strong to be denied.

Rotrou was fond of revamping Plautus in his comedies and Lope de Vega in his other dramas. His best tragi-comedy, if *Venceslas* be called like *le Cid* a tragedy, is *Laure persécutée*. His best plays are *Saint-Genest*, *Venceslas*, and *Cosroès*.

Le véritable Saint-Genest, so-called by the author to distinguish it as the "real" play on the subject from a previous one by the Norman actor-author Desfontaines, a member of Molière's early company, is one of the best tragedies in French literature. It is based on Lope de Vega's *Lo fingido Verdadero* and the *Sanctus Adrianus martyr* of Cellot. Like *Polyeucte*, it is a religious play, portraying an actor who is converted. Genest, while performing before Diocletian and Maximin the martyrdom of Adrian, ordered not long before by Maximin himself, is touched like Polyeucte with divine grace and meets the fate of martyrdom. *Venceslas*, drawn from the play of Francisco de Rojas y Zorilla, *No hay ser padre siendo rey*, tells how one brother kills another for love of a woman, who like Chimène calls for vengeance from King Venceslas, father of the young men. He condemns his son, but pardons him at the solicitation of his courtiers. Then feeling his contradictory rule as father and king, he gives up the throne. *Cosroès* tells the story of the wicked queen Sira, a fiend like Cléopâtre in *Rodogune*, who conspires as Arsinoé in

Nicomède, in favor of her son Mardesane in place of the earlier son Siroès of her husband Cosroès.

With all his defects of incoherence and incomplete appreciation of character, Rotrou has, at least in these three plays, a vigor of expression, a dramatic intensity, which make him deserve a better lot than posterity has bestowed upon him.

CHAPTER VIII

PHILOSOPHY. DESCARTES. CARTESIANISM

CARTESIANISM is the most important expression of seventeenth-century philosophy and science. Though it would be wrong to see in it, as some have done, the principles which made French Classicism, yet it is nevertheless, like Ramism in the previous century, the characteristic manifestation of thought. It shows the tendencies which distinguish the Classical school; it has the same superior effectiveness in method and system.[1]

[1] The place of Cartesianism in modern thought and its relation to Classicism is an important question and can be satisfactorily determined only by bearing in mind two different phases. In one sense the philosophy of Descartes is non-Classical. He preached the scorn of antiquity as firmly as Ronsard had taught people to worship it; he was the father of the "moderns" in the great quarrel of the *anciens* and the *modernes;* his reason tended to undermine the religious feeling and conservative dignity of the seventeenth century and to provoke the rationalism of the eighteenth. If, particularly, we emphasise the dogmatic side of French Classicism, as the product of rules derived from technical theorists and Aristotelian commentators, then Descartes is not the philosopher of French Classicism. If, on the other hand, we consider Classicism more broadly as an intellectual temper instead of a collection of rules, then we must acknowledge the importance of the Cartesian *method* in promoting those qualities of "clarté," "ordre," "précision," "logique" of which French critics make so much. A comparison of any work of the sixteenth century with one of the seventeenth is a convincing proof, e.g. the *Art poétique* of Vauquelin de la Fresnaye and that of Boileau. In this sense Descartes is symptomatic of the best manifestation of French literary Classicism. Some critics bring out the modernity of his rationalism, as Brunetière in his essays on Descartes (*Etudes critiques*, Vol. III), on *Jansénistes et Cartésiens* (*Et. crit.* Vol. IV), on *la Formation de l'idée de progrès* (*Et. crit.* Vol. V). Others, as M. Lanson,

René Descartes (1596–1650), a native of Touraine, was educated chiefly at the Jesuit college of La Flèche, where he was known as a youthful prodigy with great aptitudes for mathematics. While still a stripling he became convinced that the learning of the age was defective, and resolved to begin by discarding book knowledge, and to acquire instead a first-hand acquaintance with the world, either by undisturbed solitary reflection upon its problems, or by viewing, as a disinterested spectator, the phases of its activity. After a period of solitude he volunteered for military service under a foreign prince, Maurice of Nassau, Prince of Orange, and shared in Holland and in Germany in the incidents of the Thirty Years' War. Then he travelled for a while alone in Europe and, finally, in 1629, he settled down in Holland, which, because of its remoteness from France and the freedom and independence of its political and intellectual life, seemed to him a suitable abode for a philosopher. There he lived for a score of years, moving occasionally to keep away from his growing fame. "Qui bene latuit bene vixit" was his motto, and Descartes showed a queer antithesis of character in the boldness of his speculations and his timidity in giving them to the public. For his innovations touched all the problems of the cosmos, from God, — though he disclaimed any intention of interfering with faith, — to physics, astronomy, mathematics, physiology, and literary style. His chief works to the student of letters are the *Discours de la Méthode*, the *Meditationes de prima philosophia*, so-called in opposition to the disputations of the Schoolmen, the *Principia philosophiae*, the *Traité des passions de l'âme*.

Descartes's mature life is closely connected with the name of the Princess Elizabeth, daughter of that Elector Palatine who was one of the causes of the Thirty Years' War, and aunt of George I of England. She was an earnest student of philosophy under the direction of Descartes, who kept up a correspondence

in his History and his monograph on Boileau, emphasise the connection of Descartes and Classicism.

with her, explaining for her the difficulties in his system and writing for her some of his works. Finally, another woman of high rank, a dabbler also in philosophy, Queen Christina of Sweden, persuaded him to come to Stockholm. But Descartes, always a valetudinarian, was unable to stand the severe winter and the change in his habits, particularly the necessity of getting up at five in the morning to discuss philosophy with the queen instead of lying in bed to meditate. The consequence was that he died within a few months.

To the French Descartes is the founder of modern philosophy, and they oppose his method to the incomplete systems of the Middle Ages and of the Renaissance on the one hand, and to the English empiricism of the Baconian school on the other. It is undeniable that Descartes marks an epoch in his country, and nearly all later philosophy was influenced by him, in spite of the opposition to one or another of his doctrines by the libertines, the Jansenists, or the Jesuits. Even Newton, to whom the science of the eighteenth century looked up, might not have developed as he did his mathematical discoveries concerning the universe, without the mechanism of Descartes's cosmology.

We have seen the characteristic of mediæval philosophy to be the authority of a misunderstood Aristotle. Ramus had declared the rights of free reason, but had substituted the authority of Plato and the "method" of the ancient poets and thinkers. Other modern philosophers tried to solve the problems of morals by the construction of utopias or cities of the sun, in imitation of the Platonic Republic. Finally, others, like Montaigne, had weakened the world of certainty by their doubt. Descartes is even more a partisan of the freedom of reason than Ramus, he pushes doubt beyond Montaigne. The result enabled him to base knowledge on a firmer foundation than ever before, at the same time vastly broadening its scope, and to create the new dogmatism of a general impersonal Reason.

Descartes, not despairing of ultimate certainty, undertook to reach it by systematic or methodic doubt. He explains his

course of procedure chiefly in his *Discours de la méthode pour bien conduire sa raison et chercher la vérité dans les sciences.* The results of past learning seemed ineffectual to him, and Descartes, unlike Ramus, scorned the contents of the ancient literatures. Even the syllogism, the corner-stone of mediæval philosophy, is discarded as not increasing knowledge, inasmuch as the conclusion merely restates what is already contained in the premises. Mathematics and theology he excepts alone from his reprobation: Descartes wishes to remain strictly orthodox in religion, though largely as a concession to the exigencies of the time. He selected, he says, four guiding principles, the first of which is the important formula of the Cartesian revolution and indicates the substitution of reason for authority: Not to accept anything as true until clearly and evidently proved to be so. The other three rules were: To divide or analyse all difficulties as far as possible; to proceed in thought by synthesis from simple to complex; to make verifications and reviews at frequent stages of the investigation. Then, selecting certain provisional rules to guide him during his study and investigation of the world, which would enable him to live in harmony with it, he was ready to seek the ultimate certitude.

He began by rejecting everything which could admit of the least doubt, as susceptible of falseness: the authority of the senses, of memory, even of necessary truths. Let us suppose, suggested Descartes in his famous hypothesis of the *Dieu malin*, that there is deceit in everything and that some wicked God takes pleasure in making me believe as a necessary truth what is not. Let us imagine that two and two do not make four, that the hill is not higher than the valley. There remains one fact of absolute certainty: whether I think correctly or incorrectly, I think. Hence I exist: *Cogito, ergo sum.*

Descartes's opponents charged this argument with being logically false and with being a *petitio principii* or argument in a circle, inasmuch as "I think, therefore I am," necessitates the assumption "That which thinks, is." Or to put it otherwise,

"I think = I am thinking, therefore I am" merely means "I am, therefore I am," which is a pleonasm. But Descartes replied that it was an intuition or immediate apperception of consciousness, requiring no previous statement, syllogism or inference. And having at last reached one to him undeniable element of certainty, the existence of the self or thinker, he proceeds from it to reconstruct the certainty of God and of the world.

The existence of God is susceptible of three proofs. The first two are nearly identical and are based on the consciousness of man's own imperfection. From the fact that man is imperfect and knows it, but can conceive some one more perfect than himself, Descartes infers that this very idea of greater perfection must have come from one who is more perfect, or God, who possesses all the attributes contained in the idea we have of perfection. Secondly, my weakness and the imperfection of my existence, which I realise, show that I am contingent upon something more perfect and that I hold my being from God. My dependency necessitates some independent being on whom I depend. The third proof is the ontological argument already used in the Middle Ages by Saint Anselm, that the idea of a perfect being implies the existence of a perfect being, just as the idea of a triangle involves the necessity of the triangle even though we cannot construct the perfect one.

The existence of God once established, Descartes throws on him the responsibility for the outer world. The existence of the world depends on the idea of God, the truth of the world depends on the truth of God. We have a feeling that certain notions come to us of external things. These things must be true, or God who caused the feelings would be deceiving us. But God in his goodness cannot wish to do this, so things are as they seem. Thus all rests on a firm foundation, and opportunity for doubt or scepticism has passed away.

The result which Descartes has reached so far is the establishment of a rationalistic idealism dogmatically imposed, and

implying a dualism of mind and body. The philosopher's mathematical tendencies lead him to apply the laws of mechanics to the whole physical and physiological world, and so the universe is to be explained by geometrical and algebraic propositions. Scientifically this was a tremendous step in advance over the past, and though the details of Descartes's cosmology seem fanciful today and his vortices and subtle matter express exploded theories of *a priori* reasoning, yet he substituted law and order for chaos. To reject the old Scholastic "substantial forms," which explained nothing new, but replaced the cause of anything merely by another name ("the magnet attracts because it has a magnetic quality"), was a great progress. The world was now reducible to terms of mechanical law and susceptible to the accurate observations of true science.

The same tendencies are exhibited in Descartes's theories of physiology and psychology. The body is a pure mechanism, but man differs from animals in that he has the soul which they have not. Animals have no feeling whatsoever and are well-organised machines: the cry in a dog's throat when he is apparently hurt is merely the reverberation of a resonant tube, the result of mechanical effort externally applied. We now come to the weakest part of the Cartesian doctrine: How can we explain the parallel action of mind and body in man, or the action of mind on an inert body, inasmuch as they apparently stand apart in an absolute dualism? This question Descartes never did answer quite to the satisfaction of all his own followers, and it was to do away with the difficulty that Geulincx and Malebranche devised slightly varying theories of Occasionalism. Geulincx harmonised by God the corresponding actions of mind and body, Malebranche saw all in God, that is, made God the simultaneous cause of each action of mind and body. Leibnitz, a descendant of Descartes, solved the difficulty by his theory of pre-established harmony.

It is obvious what an improvement Cartesianism marks over the previous age. For the first time an orderly method made

itself felt in all expressions of thought. Even in literary form the result can be seen: Though Descartes's style is not particularly clear or limpid, yet in prose the qualities of orderly arrangement, clearness, conciseness, accuracy of definition were appreciated as they never had been before, and French became, what it has remained, one of the best vehicles for the expression of abstract ideas and for criticism. Descartes put French prose under the guidance of reason, or was, at any rate, the greatest exponent of the tendency which the language was taking, just as Malherbe exemplified the same tendency in poetry.

It should not be assumed, however, that the success of Cartesianism was immediate or universal. It had to make its way against strong opposition, and its force was not fully felt in thought until the end of the seventeenth century. It underwent the most fertile transformations under Spinoza in Holland and under Leibnitz in Germany. In France the effect was seen far more in literature and in life than in the University, where the old Scholastic logic and Aristotelian peripateticism maintained their sway with an astounding strength of inertia. It was rather in the drawing-rooms or the discussions of men and women of letters that the immediate manifestations of Cartesianism were to be found. Philaminte, Bélise and Armande, in *les Femmes savantes*, planning the establishment of an academy for the discussion of philosophy and talking of *tourbillons* and *mondes tombants*, were Cartesian to the backbone. So were Mme de Grignan, Mme de Sablé or the duchesse du Maine in real life. The writers of the age were now permeated with the spirit of reason and the belief in the rule of an orthodox deity, at the same time that they saw in man and nature only mechanisms. But man was interesting because he was a rational mechanism. The romantic, mysterious, unanalysable aspects of nature they totally neglect. To Boileau, whose *Art poétique* shaped by Cartesianism and the Port-Royal logic is the handbook of Classical theory, Nature is merely human nature.

The chief foes of the philosophy of Descartes were the libertines, the sect of his former teachers the Jesuits, and in some respects, owing to a different attitude towards the world, the Jansenists. Yet the most important Cartesian handbook, the *Logic* of Port-Royal, came from the Jansenists, and the Jansenist duc de Luynes translated into French Descartes's *Meditationes*.

The philosophical libertines were the partisans of freedom in thought in place of the dogmatism of Descartes. They continued, too, the sceptical tradition of Montaigne and, instead of pushing on to certitude, rested in their doubt. When they did construct a positive science, it was as empiricists, or at any rate as opponents of theories of innate ideas. Without falling in with the pedantic conservatism of the University and the Sorbonne, which were more hostile to them than to Descartes, they represent, too, an aversion to what they considered the no less fanciful *a priori* reasonings of Descartes. The tendencies of the libertines became more productive of scientific results among their successors of the eighteenth century from Bayle to the Encyclopedists. For the present, though they number distinguished men like the physicians Gabriel Naudé and Guy Patin, one alone erected a philosophical system worthy to attract disciples. This was Pierre Gassend or Gassendi, the teacher of Molière.

Gassendi (1592–1655) considered himself an orthodox Christian, but he developed what the Church often considers a non-Christian doctrine, an empirical materialism. He was a follower of the epicureanism of Lucretius, believed that all proceeds from the senses, and he developed in physics a form of the atomistic theory. He never admitted the dogmatism of Descartes, and his affirmation never went beyond *videtur*. The superiority which Descartes attributed to the mind and to the innate ideas with which the mind was endowed, were to him ludicrous. "*O mens*," and "*O caro*," they termed each other. To Gassendi all ideas come from the senses; the mind is but an emanation from the body. These views were, it is true, far less original than those of Descartes, and their chief intellectual

value lay in their artful eclecticism. But they were maintained by Gassendi with great strength, and his own value is indicated by his goodly following: Molière, Chapelle, Bernier, Cyrano, and the epicureans of the second half of the century.

The Jesuits were hostile to Cartesianism, and were its chief persecutors. Though they would have been horrified to find themselves classed with the libertines, they also tended in their metaphysical theories towards empiricism. They did not go to its usual consequences, determinism in morals. They derived their empirical tendency from their connection with the orthodox Aristotelianism of the Schools, and maintained that "nihil est in intellectu quod non fuerit prius in sensu." It seemed to them, too, that in creating his spiritualistic philosophy, Descartes was making the faculties of man encroach upon the domain of faith, and that the God of Descartes was in opposition to the orthodox deity. God and man stood apart, and it was sacrilegious to make the conviction of God's existence depend upon the existence of the self. Their most skilful attacks were made by their partisan the learned bishop of Avranches Huet, who was indignant also at Descartes's scorn for the erudition of the ancients.

The attitude of the Jansenists, in so far as they opposed Cartesianism, was a different one. The Jansenists were not so much metaphysicians as theologians, yet their creed was based on a fundamental principle of pessimism, of the corruption of human nature and the impotence of reason. Descartes was an optimist, whose reason opened the way for the theories of indefinite progress of the eighteenth century. But Arnauld and Nicole, in their work on logic, the *Art de penser* or *Logique de Port-Royal*, are Cartesians. This art of "conducting one's reason" expounds the Aristotelian syllogism, but extends the sphere of logic to method and the application of thought to the discovery of new truth.

The greatest French disciple of Descartes in the seventeenth century, one of the greatest metaphysicians of modern French

philosophy, and one of the clearest writers of his day, was Nicolas Malebranche (1638-1715). He was a priest of the order of the Oratoire, which had always sympathised with Cartesianism, and in its philosophical tendencies turned towards idealism. He was himself the example of pure reason, and so etherealised that, anecdote says, he died from excitement over a discussion upon the existence of matter with the English idealist Berkeley. Malebranche sublimates still more the system of Descartes into a form of Platonism, at the same time turning it into a theology. God becomes the cause and author of all things; in him we live and move and have our being; our feeling and our ideas we "see in God." From the point of view of the understanding, God possesses all the intelligible ideas of all human beings, and through our union with God we see and feel in him external objects, not only as they appear to us in their concrete yet smaller truth, but also in their eternal principle. God holds in himself the "types" of all things in intelligible, but not in material, extension. This extension by the act of God manifests to us the concrete and material, though it is in itself neither concrete nor material. What makes us really sure of the outside world is the evidence of faith and revelation. From the point of view of the will there is no connection between the two halves of the dualism of mind and body, inner and outer world, except by the continual intervention of God. Causation does not exist except in "occasional" causes at the constant instigation of God. God and the soul we see direct and not by their ideas. Hence our notion of the soul, though truer than of things, is less clear, because God has not given us its archetype.

This position of God and the relation of the mind to him enlarges the rôle of reason. It is reason that links human intellects with the common source, God. Reason is one and identical, the single wisdom or Word of God, theologically made visible in Christ. Thus reason is universal, and it is because we are all in spiritual union with God that we have the same rational and necessary truths. Reason guides us, too, not

only intellectually but in morals and politics, for true reason cannot deceive.

Thus in Malebranche the reason of Classicism has reached its apotheosis, and similarly the great Classical writers, Bossuet or Boileau, whatever the actual connotation they give to the term and however little they may agree with the details of Malebranche's philosophy, have the idea of universal reason.

CHAPTER IX

RELIGION. JANSENISM. PORT-ROYAL. PASCAL

THE religious thought of a great part of the seventeenth century turns about Port-Royal and the disputes between the Jansenists and the Jesuits. The chief spokesman for the Jansenists was Pascal.

The older foundation of Port-Royal was a convent for nuns in a then secluded country district about six leagues from Paris, connected with the Cistercian order. At the end of the sixteenth century it had fallen into a condition of almost total decay. It contained only a few nuns, living not impeccable lives and ruled by a lady abbess even more worldly than they. In 1602 a young girl of eleven belonging to the Arnauld family was through influence installed as abbess. She was to be famous later as the Mère Angélique. At first she felt no call to her vocation, but in 1608 she underwent several mental and emotional crises and became sincere in her religious faith. She immediately instituted numerous reforms in the establishment and so worked on the minds of all her kin that the whole Arnauld family of men and women became the props of Port-Royal and its new doctrine of Jansenism. In 1626 the convent was moved to Paris as Port-Royal-de-Paris, the parent establishment at Port-Royal-des-Champs becoming a branch, to the neighborhood of which men of learning, known as *solitaires*, withdrew to live a half-hermit life of prayer, meditation and study. It was the life of simplicity and toil that was to distinguish the Oratorians and the Benedictines, that Dr. Pusey sought to institute in England in the Tractarian period, and that in spirit, though not in form, was akin to the community of Little Gidding, familiar to readers of

John Inglesant, which the same seventeenth century saw in England.

Meanwhile the doctrines of Jansenism were introduced by Du Vergier de Hauranne, abbé de Saint-Cyran (1581–1643), a friend of Jansenius, who became *directeur spirituel* of Port-Royal in 1636. Cornelius Jansen or Jansenius, bishop of Ypres, was the author of the *Augustinus*, published in 1640 shortly after his death, an elaborate study of the theories of Saint Augustine and a new enunciation of his doctrine of absolute fatalism, which had already been made by Calvin the basis of his religion, itself the source of the Hell-and-damnation theology of Jonathan Edwards. Jansenism and Calvinism, as forms of Augustinianism, are almost identical in their gloom and austerity and in their doctrine of Grace. It was in questions like that of the sacraments that they were at variance. Indeed, the Port-Royalists, illogically but as a matter of course, considered Calvinism a heresy. By the time Antoine Arnauld, "le grand Arnauld" (1612–1694), wrote an apology of the *Augustinus*, Jansenism became inseparably linked with Port-Royal.

The belief of the Jansenists turned on the question of Grace, as a consequence of the Fall of man. The sin of Adam involved all mankind, which can turn to God only by the act of his Grace, the source of faith and irresistible. But God uses this Grace only to save a few by his unconditioned and unchangeable decree. All other men, in spite of good deeds, are predestined to eternal damnation and their will is utterly unable to choose.

These views were opposed by the Jesuits, who admitted the necessity of Grace, but declared that man's will was free to choose or to reject Grace. If the Jansenists were Augustinians, the Jesuits were Semi-Pelagians. The Pelagian heresy in the early Christian Church had denied the condemnation of mankind in Adam's fall, and had declared the freedom of man to seek his own salvation. The Semi-Pelagians, among whom were the Jesuits and the majority of Catholics, felt that the Fall had not totally perverted but had injured man. In his weakness his will may

be helped by the Grace of God acting with it; though the actual salvation should be attributed not so much to one's own merit as to the effect of God's Grace. The Jesuits thought that Grace is granted to all and is therefore *sufficient*, but is made efficacious or inefficacious as man chooses. The Jansenists maintained that no Grace could be sufficient which was not *efficacious*. Consequently Grace acted regardless of the will of man. On the other hand, Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism put the beginning of his own regeneration in the power of a fallen being. To the Jansenists this destroyed the necessity and value of redemption.

The history of Jansenism is one of a valiant struggle against opposition and persecution. The Jansenists, though sometimes worldly and self-seeking, were as a rule unbending, high-principled men, averse to compromise. Their influence came rather from their vigor of conscience than from their numbers, and by their teachers they influenced some of the greatest men of the day, such as Racine and Boileau in literature, and constituted an important social set, including Mme de Longueville, Mme de Sablé, the prince de Conti. Port-Royal was the home of good but intolerant men, and the convent itself the abiding-place of nuns of whom it was said that they were "pures comme des anges mais orgueilleuses comme des démons." Antoine Arnauld, author of the *Fréquente communion* and nearly two score other volumes, was with Pascal the protagonist in the fight against the Jesuits, though his kinsmen Antoine Le Maître and Le Maître de Saci were among the many combatants. At the beginning of the eighteenth century persecution had performed its task: the convent was closed and the nuns dispersed. Before long Jansenism, which had always had a proneness to mysticism, degenerated among many into common superstition, and the extraordinary pathological manifestations of the *convulsionnaires* at the wonder-working tomb of the diacre Pâris.

The greatest of Jansenist prose writers was Blaise Pascal (1623-1662), whose many-sided intellect touched almost every phase

of the life of his time. He was the youngest son of a distinguished representative of a *famille de robe*, and his sisters Mme Périer and Jacqueline were women of great merit, especially the latter. Blaise lost his mother at the age of three, and his father superintended the boy's education with constantly growing amazement at his prodigious intellect, which showed an extraordinary aptitude for mathematical discovery and scientific investigation. In his literary training Pascal grew to know among the moderns Montaigne, Saint François de Sales, Charron, Du Vair, and Corneille.

Excessive mental activity working in a frail body had the inevitable result. Pascal became the prey to constant illness and melancholia. At this very inopportune time for the alleviation of his mental condition he got acquainted in 1646 with the gloomy doctrines of Jansen. At Rouen Pascal came to know books by Jansen, Saint-Cyran, and Arnauld through some medical friends who attended his father after an accident. The whole family was affected, but Blaise the first and the most of all. He experienced a first conversion, and soon showed his tendency to put faith above reason by his controversy with a priest of Rouen, the Frère Saint-Ange, who proclaimed that reason was sufficient to make one know the mysteries of religion. After a trip of Pascal to Paris a few months later, his sister Jacqueline tried to enter Port-Royal. Her father opposed the project and she did not carry it out until later, when she became a close tie between her brother and the sisterhood.

Meanwhile Pascal's scientific investigations progressed in spite of constant ill-health. He had in his childhood composed a treatise on conic sections and, perhaps earlier yet, one on sound; he had devised a calculating machine, and at Rouen had made experiments on atmospheric weight. In 1647 he published his *Nouvelles expériences touchant le vide*, and continued them in 1648, carrying on the endeavors of Galileo and Torricelli. His entire scientific method, experimental and concrete, was very different from the *a priori* analytic method and meta-

physical system of Descartes, whose "subtle matter" amused Pascal. But it was still more anathema to the Jesuits, whose science was full of metaphysical and scholastic explanations by words and general terms, and who preferred to use the old statement that "nature abhors a vacuum" rather than the new scientific explanations of Pascal.

During a visit of his family to Auvergne in 1649 Pascal remained in Paris, where for a time religion gave way to social interests. He became acquainted with certain men of fashion but of intellectual tastes, the duc de Roannez, the chevalier de Méré, an example of the seventeenth-century *honnête homme* or man of the world, the sceptic and intellectual *libertin* Miton. These men helped Pascal to rub off some of his provincial modes of thought. By contact with them his style undoubtedly acquired polish. And perhaps he had a little love-affair. Meanwhile he made practical inventions, such as an arithmetical machine, devised the hydraulic press, a dray for transporting weights, and afterwards hit on the notion of public vehicles like the modern omnibus. At one time or another of his life he worked out the theory of probabilities in games of chance, and foresaw the questions in pure mathematics of differential and integral calculus. At this period, then, Pascal in spite of continual ill-health is in the full plenitude of his intellectual development, and besides his scientific works has composed a few interesting fragments, such as his *discours* on love, though the authenticity of this work is doubted. The discussion of Montaigne in the *Entretien avec M. de Saci* was perhaps written a few months after his second "conversion."

This occurred in the autumn of 1654. If we neglect the old story of a carriage accident at Neuilly in which he nearly lost his life, the predisposing cause was a sermon, after which Pascal experienced the action of Grace, the inspiration of God, the joys of renunciation and of sacrifice. He withdrew to Port-Royal,[1]

[1] Nevertheless Pascal is not to be considered as specifically a "solitaire" as the majority of those who come under that designation. Some writers

and during the brief period which was left him to live, he tried to annihilate all consideration of self, and to seek faith and life everlasting through the consciousness of the inspiration of God. He wrote a brief and disconnected expression of his feelings and carried it always with him sewn into his clothes as a sort of reminder or "*mémorial*," miscalled by scoffers an "amulet." His mysticism was strengthened by the miracle of the Holy Thorn at Port-Royal which happened to his niece; his endurance was tried but not overcome by agonising ill-health. But he played a rôle in the history of Jansenism by his *Lettres provinciales*, and planned a great "Apology" of Christian faith of which the *Pensées* are but fragmentary notes. At last he died in 1662 at the age of thirty-nine, one of the most universal geniuses the world has known.

The question arises as to the sanity of Pascal. His detractors, such as Voltaire, have dwelt upon his hallucinations and the morbid asceticism or self-torture of his last years. It is true that he showed all the pathological symptoms of acute religious mania, with its emotional sensibility, its automatisms in the shape of convulsions, its luminous visions or photisms, leading to the ecstatic happiness of mystic feeling so entirely emotional and not to be rationalised. It was precisely this sweeping of the mind into the happiness of faith and belief, and the conviction of the truth of religion, that was to Pascal the action of the Grace of God.

Yet the irrational sensibility is not inconsistent with the intellect, and in Pascal did not stand in its way. His religious life was, as with millions of men, purely emotional and divorced from the need of reason, though he did apply the calculation of probabilities to the truth of God. But his reason remained as keen in its discussion of the subtleties of the different kinds of Grace, of its power, and the hair-splittings of the science of casuistry. The brain which was responsible for all Pascal's

even hint that Pascal repented of his heresies before he died. This is very doubtful and, anyhow, would not weigh against his earlier life.

discoveries and inventions may have been pathologically abnormal: it was insane only as genius itself is by some writers considered insanity.

It was in January, 1655, that the hostility between the Jesuits and the Jansenists reached an acute condition. A priest of Saint-Sulpice, the Père Picoté, refused communion to the duc de Liancourt because he gave hospitality in his home to a Jansenist, the abbé de Bourzeys, member of the Academy, and allowed his granddaughter to be brought up at Port-Royal. Arnauld entered the fray, and, after the exchange of several documents, he was rebuked and condemned by the Sorbonne. He appealed to Pascal for help, and the latter issued his first *Provinciale* on January 23, 1656. The polemic lasted until March, 1657; Pascal wrote eighteen letters and began a nineteenth.

The author was full of a neophyte's enthusiasm and directed his sharpest satire against the Jesuits. The attack took the form of letters from a certain Louïs de Montalte in Paris to a friend in the provinces, who may have stood for Pascal's brother-in-law M. Périer. The name Montalte may have been suggested by the fact that Pascal came from Auvergne, the country of the "high mountain," the Puy de Dôme. The first letter appeared under the title of *Lettre écrite à un provincial par un de ses amis sur le sujet des disputes présentes de la Sorbonne.* The whole collection was known as the *Lettres de Louis de Montalte à un provincial de ses amis et aux RR.PP. jésuites sur la morale et la politique de ces pères.* The first four letters deal with the question of dogma, to which the author returns in the last two letters. The others deal with the moral theories of the Jesuits.

The whole dispute is but an episode in the great quarrel between the two schools of thought. In 1653 the Jesuits had denounced the *Augustinus* and had brought about the condemnation by Pope Innocent X of the famous five propositions which they asserted to be contained in it. With regard to these

propositions the Jansenists indulged in some quibbling worthy of casuistical Jesuits, and argued the distinction between the *questions de droit et de fait*, between the truth and falsehood of the opinions themselves, and whether they could or could not be found in the *Augustinus*. The pope, they maintained, could condemn the doctrines in themselves, but he was mistaken in the fact of thinking them in the *Augustinus*. In this way they got round the papal infallibility. Indeed, to support their other contention that their doctrines were not like those of Calvin, the Jansenists were forced to do a great deal of hedging. And Pascal, whether intentionally or not, at times misquoted his adversaries and exaggerated or strained their statements. But his methods are common in such warfare, and it was the violence of his attack, the bitter sarcasm of his criticism, that overcame his foes and dealt them a blow in public estimation from which they have never fully recovered. If the Jesuits are today the most hated by the French of the Catholic orders, the byword for all that is treacherous, the embodiment to the radicals of everything evil in the constant struggle between clericalism and its enemies, it is to Pascal, even if he had a precursor in Etienne Pasquier, that the conception is chiefly indebted for its origin.[1]

The dogmatic discussion turned on the question of Grace, to which allusion has already been made. It is somewhat complicated, however, in Pascal's controversy by the middle position occupied by the Dominicans or Thomists, as they were called as followers of St. Thomas Aquinas. The chief point of dispute between the Jesuits and the Jansenists was on the sufficiency or efficacy of Grace. The Jesuits, Semi-Pelagians as the Jansenists termed them, or Molinists as they preferred to be called because of their dependence on the doctrines of Molina, made efficacy hang on the free choice of the will. The Jansenists

[1] For a judicious criticism of the influence of the Jesuits in France at all times, see the introduction by Gabriel Monod to the French translation of H. Böhmer's work on the Jesuits.

thought that no Grace could be sufficient which did not carry with it its own efficacy, and therefore the only free will is that of God who imparts it. The Thomists, said Pascal, seem to be in agreement with the Jesuits by asserting a sufficient Grace given to all, but they are really in harmony with the Jansenists by requiring also an efficacious Grace which all do not receive. Thus their sufficient Grace does not suffice.

A similar subtleness appears in the different interpretations of the *pouvoir prochain* or "proximate power," a term which Pascal accused the Jesuits and Dominicans, or Molinists and Thomists leagued together, of using in order to cloud the issue, though they understood the word *prochain* differently. The Thomists agreed with the Molinists that sufficient Grace must be efficacious. They added, however, that even to one who has not full Grace there can be a "proximate power" of accomplishing good, just as a boat and oars are the "proximate power" for a man who wishes to cross a stream, but whose power is unavailing without those proximate concomitants.

Pascal shows the same brilliancy in his attack upon casuistry. This was the science teaching the solution of "cases" or problems of conscience, in which the mind in its hesitation sought the assistance of an adviser's judgment. The problems result from the conflicting opinions which exist concerning the moral quality of an action, and the task of the casuist was not merely to select the best, but quite as much to justify the different opinions on the ground of the "probability" of all the different views maintained by different authorities, and to make it lawful in good conscience to follow the less probable of two probable opinions. To the unscrupulous man the way was thus open for almost any course of action: he could justify nearly any procedure by an explanation intended itself for quite another chain of events or set of circumstances. It was likely to degenerate from "probabilism" and ethical opportunism into a sort of religious Machiavellianism, a system for the justification of any crime which the agent might have committed or might want

to commit. The means were made to justify the end. The result of a thoroughgoing application of casuistry tends to do away with a fixed moral standard by weakening its certainty for the sake of the "probability" of any more attractive rule.

Though the Jesuits were not the inventors of casuistry, there had been many writers on casuistry among them, and they found the flexibility of its teachings convenient in making their own doctrines attractive. To an austere and unbending Jansenist like Pascal nothing could be more loathsome, and the names of Escobar and Sanchez stank in his nostrils. By a large number of quotations drawn from their writings, and in many cases separated from the context, he tried to show that the Jesuits were the apologists of every form of vice and immorality, that their writers were prurient-minded, and by inference profligates. At the same time he let loose his shafts upon their methods of "equivocation" and of "mental restriction," by which a person might pass himself off as appearing to say the exact opposite of what was in his mind or what were his real thoughts.

In his attack Pascal was often unjust, and in the underlying motives both sides were obviously at fault. The doctrine of the Jesuits laid itself open to untold abuse by the unscrupulous; though the defence was that the treatises on casuistry were never intended for common use but only as a help to the spiritual adviser himself. The uncompromising attitude of Pascal would have made the workings of a moral law impossible by imposing it on humanity in its most unattractive forms.

The *Provinciales*, as a contribution to contemporary polemics, are not, however, Pascal's chief claim to literary greatness. For some time he had had in mind the idea of writing an Apology or Defence of Christianity. To this end he made constant notes, and jotted down his reflections, sometimes brief to the verge of incoherence, sometimes redundant, nearly always eloquent. He died before he had even begun to arrange his material, and the fragments remain only in the shape of *Pensées*.

Many editions have been published since then, but the grouping and classifying has necessarily varied with the system of each successive editor.

The *Pensées* are the summing up of Pascal's thought, and one of the great masterpieces of French literature. Much of the material has become so familiar that one often fails to recognise its profundity and its novelty at the time when these thoughts were new and unfamiliar to men. The effect of Pascal's work was to give depth to French literature, and nobility, separable from a stilted artificial dignity, to French style. The author adds, too, a personal emotion which places him apart from the Classical writers of his age.

The starting-point of Pascal is the doubt at which Montaigne took his stand. Indeed, though the *Pensées* are to a great degree the confutation of the *Essais*, they are for that reason permeated with the whole doctrine of Montaigne, and Pascal would never have been what he was had it not been for the sixteenth-century writer. But Pascal was not a *homo unius libri*. He had steeped himself in the Bible, in the pessimism of St. Augustine and of Jansenius, in the mysticism of Saint François de Sales, in the stoicism of Du Vair, in the scepticism of Charron, in the rhetoric of Balzac. He had made himself a stoic in morals; he started from pyrrhonism in his general intellectual attitude.

But the indifference of Montaigne was something with which Pascal could not remain satisfied. Not only did the cruder arguments, such as the calculation of probabilities, incline him to the belief in a God, but the very weakness and insignificance of man in front of an overwhelming nature made something rise up within him to protest against his despair and realise that the weight of terror can be relieved by faith. Man, having reached the conclusion that reason is unavailing for the solution of the mystery, throws himself into the outstretched arms of religion. There are three means of belief: reason, custom, inspiration. Christianity does not admit those who believe by reason alone:

he mind must open itself to proof, seek confirmation by custom, ut offer itself by humiliation to the inspirations which alone an produce the true result. By accepting the truths of Chris-ianity and the expiation of original sin, we understand our ondition and see a cure for our wretchedness: "Le cœur a des-aisons que la raison ne connaît point; on le sait en mille choses. . . . C'est le cœur qui sent Dieu et non la raison. Voilà ce que c'est que la foi; Dieu sensible au cœur, non à la raison."

The *Pensées* are thus an effort to prove the necessity of Christianity and the truth of God, starting from the insignificance of man and his consciousness that even then he is greater than the blind weight which seems to crush him: "L'homme n'est qu'un roseau, le plus faible de la nature, mais c'est un roseau pensant." It may be possible, too, to conceive a man without hands, feet, or head, but a man without thought is inconceivable.

Thus the stages of Pascal's argument, had they been drawn out, would probably have coincided with the phases of his own mental struggle: At first doubt and despair as well as terror, then the happy confidence of a comforting faith reached, not by inductive or deductive reasoning, but by the instant conviction which the mystic feels of the certainty of that in which he puts his trust. Mankind seems to the observer like a chain-gang of criminals condemned to death, each one in agony awaiting his turn. As man realises the vast spaces which close about him, ignorant of why and whence, and knowing only that he must die and pass to a still vaster unknown, he stands aghast. "Le silence éternel de ces espaces infinis m'effraie." But the final conviction is that which Pascal had expressed in his "amulet": "Joie, joie, joie, pleurs de joie."

No better idea is needed of the majesty of Pascal's conceptions than the often-quoted passage in which man is shown standing between two immensities, the infinitely vast and the infinitely small. Above him appears the universe, great beyond the conception of mortal mind. Below him extends another universe, in which the slightest insect has all the rich complexity

of man. "Car enfin qu'est-ce qu'un homme dans la nature? Un néant à l'égard de l'infini, un tout à l'égard du néant, un milieu entre rien et tout."

It is this attitude of Pascal in presence of the awfulness of the world that makes us realise the peculiar quality of his thought and its expression. The language of the *Pensées* is sometimes disconnected and jerky, like notes hastily jotted down, often redundant, many a time unduly compressed. But it is permeated with the spirit of constructive imagination and its lyrical utterances. The writer is a poet giving concrete form to his visions, as his eye ranges over the vastness of the infinite and he feels the consciousness of that which alone enables him to stand before it. Thus Pascal brought French writers into the presence of new problems and made familiar to them new vistas of thought.

From the technical point of view, both the *Provinciales* and the *Pensées* contributed to the moulding of a pattern for French style. The *Provinciales* gave snap to a prose which had wandered from the incoherent looseness of the sixteenth-century syntax to the Johnsonian ponderousness of Balzac. The *Pensées* made possible the treatment of the deepest problems of thought in a language that a layman could understand, and in a style of deep austerity yet of poetic grace. The rhetoric of Corneille is the counterpart, though far superior, of that of Balzac; the language of Pascal has much of the smoothness that Racine introduced into tragedy.

CHAPTER X

RELIGION. MORALS AND EDUCATION

THE seventeenth century, in spite of the apparent destruction of Huguenot power, is characterised by much religious and ethical controversy. It is true that the chief philosopher of Classicism, Descartes, though he has much to say concerning the power and infinity of God, does not make him intervene very actively in the course of the world, and does not link metaphysics and theology closely together. It was this which made Pascal say: "Je ne puis pardonner à Descartes; il aurait bien voulu dans toute sa philosophie se passer de Dieu mais il n'a pu s'empêcher de lui faire donner une chiquenaude pour faire mettre le monde en mouvement." It is Malebranche, as we have seen, who makes the philosophy of Descartes theological.

But there were plenty of manifestations of spiritual or unspiritual feeling. The orthodox scepticism of Charron continued the pyrrhonism of Montaigne, which shows its influence also in the religious unbelief of so many of the libertines or free-thinkers, whose intellectual independence led some of them to break the bonds of religion and of morals. They were often under the inspiration of Vanini, put to death at Toulouse, the home of bigotry and repression, in 1619. Like Descartes they proclaimed doubt, and like Descartes they were accused of unorthodoxy. But unlike Descartes, they rested in their doubt, and hence men like Théophile and Cyrano de Bergerac were charged with atheism. Théophile's religious inconstancy laid him open to the attacks of the Jesuits, and Cyrano in his cult

of nature far outstripped his master Gassendi and seemed at times to justify the accusations.

A diametrically opposite spirit is that of Saint François de Sales (1567–1622), the venerated bishop of Geneva. He was a native of Savoy, but was educated by the Jesuits at Paris, who perhaps helped to develop in him his natural bias towards a flowery style. Becoming a priest against his father's will, he tried in the last years of the sixteenth century to convert the district of Chablais, a stronghold of Protestantism. He was unsuccessful, though by his gentle spirit he made some important conversions. His efforts to persuade Théodore de Bèze were less fruitful. His first writings were a series of tracts, called the *Controverses*, and the *Défense de l'étendard de la croix*.

Coming to Paris on an ecclesiastical mission in 1602, Saint François de Sales grew intimate with a set of people steeped in religious feeling, especially Mme Acarie, and with mystical tendencies. He gave up hoping to convert Protestants, and became the spiritual guide of Catholics towards a better faith. He directed his preaching towards this end, and delivered sermons full of honeyed sweetness, trying to destroy the pride of men, wherein he saw the source of their defects, and to encourage the quest for perfection, which to him lay in a state of the soul. He won great power over women, and as the spiritual adviser of Mme de Chantal, a widow full of the feeling of mysticism, he established with her the order of the Visitation.

The chief work of Saint François de Sales is the *Introduction à la vie dévote*. This book of Christian meditation, full of flowery imagery and the love of innocence, came as a happy reaction against the violences of sixteenth-century warfare. Its analysis of the conscience and inner devotion has made it a favorite work even among many Protestants. To the meditative and self-questioning mind it was a comfort and a consolation. His other great work was the *Traité de l'amour de Dieu*, setting forth the mystic love of God and teaching how we go to him, not because of his majesty, but because such is the true course of

our hearts led by the beautiful and the good. The quietism of Mme Guyon, the late form of seventeenth-century mysticism, is in germ in the writings of Saint François de Sales.

In his analyses of feeling, Saint François tends somewhat to preciosity by making thought more supple and refined and full of delicate shades. In language and thought it is almost a commonplace to compare him with d'Urfé, for both writers give analyses of love and studies of the human heart. The love is much of the same kind in both, though the object be different, in the one the love of man and woman, in the other the love of the Creator and the created one: "Etre dévot, c'est aimer, la foi et l'amour doivent devenir une seule et même chose." Moreover d'Urfé and Saint François are fond of the same gentle phrases and figures of speech.

A more militant influence with a more concrete effect upon education and society was exercised by the Jesuits. This brotherhood had been founded in Paris in the sixteenth century by Loyola, and Frenchmen had always been prominent in it. The Jesuits aimed from the start at the control of education and were rivals of the University. They were opposed to the paganism of the Humanists, but instead of breaking with the Renaissance, they tried to turn it their way, and in 1564 established the Collège de Clermont. This school became in the seventeenth century the most powerful establishment of learning in Paris, with from two to three thousand pupils.

There was great hostility against the Jesuits based on their greed for power and their political intrigues during the Ligue. The University and the Parlement were arrayed against them, and in the name of the Parlement Etienne Pasquier and Antoine Arnauld thundered against them. Banished for a time under Henry IV, then readmitted, they were accused of complicity in the crime of Ravaillac, who was putting into practice the theories of the Jesuit Mariana on regicide. But they won the victory, and all through the seventeenth century they were the confessors of royalty and of the nobility, the P. Cotton to Henry IV,

the P. La Chaise and the P. Le Tellier to Louis XIV. In an age, too, when every family of importance had its spiritual adviser or *directeur de conscience*, the Jesuits made their power strongly felt. They were hated, as the quarrels with the Jansenists show, for their doctrines of casuistry and equivocation, and were blamed for much of the hypocrisy prevalent at the end of the reign of Louis XIV under the sway of Mme de Maintenon.

The influence of the Jesuits was vast on education, and they modified its trend in many respects. The University, as we have seen, was addicted to unprogressive Scholastic ways, though the Latin grammar of Van Pauteren or Despautère, at which Molière laughs, had taken the place of the mediæval manuals. Logical disputations were still rife in philosophy and in theology.

The Jesuits developed especially secondary education, as dealing with youth at the point of most effective contact for making their influence felt. The training, based largely on the *Ratio studiorum* of 1599, emphasised the spirit of emulation by the award of prizes, as in all modern French education, and the classes were organised by the selection of good scholars to act as overseers and monitors under the names of decurions, censors, prætors, and imperators. The teachers aimed at a full control of their pupils, keeping them to a large degree away from their families, but trying to make them men of the world and of society, versed in the social graces, in good breeding, and suavity of demeanor, such as should characterise the *honnête homme*. In mental discipline they developed the rhetorical side, and the Latin far more than the Greek elements of culture. There was constant writing in Latin, conversation in Latin, and the writing of Latin plays. Style was valued more than depth of erudition, so that even the study of philosophy became a discussion of formulæ, almost as bad as the Scholasticism of the University and at variance with the spirit of Cartesianism. They also laid stress on the memory as much as on the reason. Here, too, they were at variance with the rationalism of Descartes. But many of the features of the Jesuit training, the study of rhetoric and

the encouragement of emulation, have marked French education up to the present time.[1]

Another form of training was given under the auspices of the order of the Oratoire, founded at the beginning of the seventeenth century by the Cardinal Pierre de Bérulle. The Oratorians were rivals of the Jesuits, but national and Gallican in their tendencies. They allowed far greater individual liberty and were intellectually more progressive, hence they sympathised more with Descartes. Malebranche, his greatest disciple, was a member of their order.

The Jansenist schools of Port-Royal, though small as compared with the Collège de Clermont, and of brief duration, lasting from 1637 to 1661, made in the century almost as deep a mark upon education as did the Jesuit colleges, like Clermont or La Flèche. In Saint-Cyran and Lemaître they had noble inspirers, in Lancelot, Nicole, Walon de Beaupuis, and Coustel great teachers, in Lancelot's *Jardin des racines grecques* and Arnauld and Nicole's *Logic* they gave books which influenced French education for many a generation. The training which the Port-Royalists gave allowed greater value to Greek than the Jesuits did, and it aimed rather at crushing than at encouraging emulation. In consequence, also, of the gloom of the Jansenist doctrines and methods, the general effect of the Port-Royal training was to develop self-analysis.

[1] M. Compayré, in his *Histoire critique des doctrines de l'éducation*, thinks that an important element in the constitution of the conventional moulds of French Classicism was the Latin translation of the Greek rhetorician Aphthonius which was in universal use in schools. It set forth the various forms of rhetorical discussion, by an automatic but restrained and regular method, and was implicitly followed. (But it was used in Germany without producing Classicism.) — For a description in form of fiction of the Jesuit influence on youthful minds in modern days, see Edouard Estaunié's *l'Empreinte*.

CHAPTER XI

RACINE

IN Racine we get the culmination of Classic dramatic art in France. In breadth of genius he may be surpassed by Molière, in depth of thought by Pascal, in richness of language by Corneille. But in the combination of melodious verse, of skilful dramatic construction, of the analysis of passions, Racine deserves the first rank.

Jean Racine (1639–1699) was not born until three years after the great victory of Corneille, whose successful rival he was destined to be. He was left an orphan in early childhood, and was brought up under the direction of his grandmother, a Jansenist. He spent a short time in the school of the Port-Royalists,[1] under the guidance of Lancelot, Nicole, and Hamon. He finished his training at the Collège d'Harcourt, which was affiliated with Port-Royal, but gradually he fell away from the austerity of his masters and got familiar with fashionable people and with the unconventional life of actors and actresses. In 1660 his ode on the marriage of Louis XIV and Marie-Thérèse was rewarded with a gratification and pension.

Racine, who had been educated on the whole for a religious life, spent a year or more in remote Languedoc with an uncle,

[1] M. Masson-Forestier, who as a descendant of Racine's sister assumes a proprietary claim to the interpretation of his distant uncle, strongly denies the probability of any Port-Royal impress as well as any conversion after *Phèdre*. But Racine's stay at Port-Royal, though short, was at an age more susceptible than the years of actual childhood to receive an intellectual impression. It is true that Racine in his native town had been under Jansenist influences from childhood long before entering the schools of Port-Royal.

a canon at Uzès. But pining for the city, he returned to Paris. He became more and more known by poems on occasions such as the king's convalescence, received other gifts, grew intimate with Boileau and Molière, the latter of whom brought out in 1664 his first play in spite of the protests of his Port-Royalist teachers and his Jansenist kinsfolk. The next play, *Alexandre*, in 1665, was followed by a rupture with Port-Royal, and Racine wrote some bitter and sarcastic letters which he later sincerely regretted. He also broke with Molière in a way far from creditable, by taking from Molière *Alexandre* after he had had all the trouble of mounting and bringing it out, and giving it to the rival company at the Hôtel de Bourgogne.

Racine's first great triumph was *Andromaque* (1667). This was followed in quick succession by his only comedy, *les Plaideurs*, (1668), and by *Britannicus* (1669), *Bérénice* (1670), *Bajazet* (1672), *Mithridate* (1673), *Iphigénie* (1674), and *Phèdre* (1677). In the heyday of his success, for he had recently been elected to the Academy, he suddenly gave up writing plays and associating with actors, became reconciled with Port-Royal, married, and settled down to a humdrum life. The only exception was when, as historiographer of the king, along with Boileau, he had to make some uncomfortable journeys in the train of the royal armies. Finally in 1689 he wrote *Esther*, and in 1691 *Athalie*, both played at the girls' school of Saint-Cyr. Racine, who in his last months had somewhat fallen from royal favor, left besides his plays a few miscellaneous writings, of which the most important were the *Cantiques spirituels*, a short history of Port-Royal, and his correspondence.

Racine occupies a different position from Corneille in the history of French tragedy, and, though he has much less to say about rules, he follows them more closely. He has, too, a distinct theory, which is the result of his Jansenist training and of his emotional temperament. Corneille we have seen to belong to the militant age of French life, the day of vigorous wills, in which the ideal was to overcome the passions by strength

of will. Racine also is a disciple of reason, but the word has a different meaning with him. Literature must be reasonable and free from fantastic interpretations of character, complicated plots and impossible climaxes. Reason appears, then, in the author rather than in the chief character, and the whole plot gains in naturalness and in *vraisemblance*.

The hero or heroine might very well show the defeat of reason by the passions, and in this is shown the effect of Racine's Jansenism, especially in such a play as *Phèdre* depicting fallen nature without the illumination of Grace. For Racine believed, or tried to show, that human nature is corrupt, that the evil passions prevail. It is the victory of these passions that he portrays in the tragedies, and the one on which he dwells most frequently is love. Racine was easily excited by this emotion, and he had several *liaisons* with noted actresses like la Du Parc and la Champmeslé. Women were what interested him most, and he delighted in analysing their character. He had seen and studied the hotblooded and passionate southern women of Languedoc as well as the intriguing women of Paris. "Fair women full of Attic grace," says Jules Lemaître, "but who lack the Grace of God." M. Larroumet points out that of the nine great tragedies of Racine, omitting the early *Thébaïde* and *Alexandre*, six are named for women, and of the remaining three two could as well be called "Agrippine" and "Roxane" as *Britannicus* and *Bajazet*. We might add that it would not take much to change *Mithridate* into "Monime." It is love, then, victorious over reason, that he portrays, the triumph of the bad over the good. This is why Racine is especially a character painter dealing with problems of passion, whereas Corneille is the poet of situations. And love is absent from only two of Racine's plays, for he usually saw in the chief character the favorite actress for whom he was writing, and people rightly quoted the saying, "Racine fait des tragédies pour la Champmeslé."

The analysis of character is precisely what makes the simplicity

of Racine's plays, so far as outer incident is concerned. They are not full of complicated events difficult to follow, which made the application of the rules such a task for Corneille. Racine chose by preference an "inner" action or problem of character: he is a psychological poet, and his plays are studies of individual *états d'âme* or crises. They can consequently be brought down to the simplest form, and the unities of time and place no longer stand in the way. This does not imply lack of action, for to him a tragedy is "the imitation of a complete action in which several persons participate." The parts had to be properly united, and when he had succeeded in linking the scenes together he used to consider his work practically done.

But the action was where Racine's originality came in, his theory of invention being "Faire quelque chose de rien." He took his starting-point in an emotional crisis of a character of antiquity, except in *Bajazet*, and worked out the crisis, which was usually some form of love. Nothing can be more simple than such an action, and the only complication lies in the coming and going of the subsidiary characters.

Thus the plots of Racine are easy to sum up in a brief sentence. Whereas a play by Corneille demands considerable explanation, M. Janet points out that we can give the contents of *Andromaque* almost as a mathematical formula. Inasmuch as Oreste loves Hermione, Hermione Pyrrhus, and Pyrrhus Andromaque,[1] but Pyrrhus is at times ready to play off Hermione against Andromaque, and Hermione does the same to Oreste and Pyrrhus, the plot may be represented by the action of the two movable points H. and P. (Hermione and Pyrrhus) between the fixed extremes O. and A. (Oreste and Andromaque):

$$\text{O.} \longleftarrow \text{H.} \longleftarrow \text{P.} \longrightarrow \text{A.}$$

Voltaire summed up *Bérénice* as "Un amant et une maîtresse qui se quittent," and Victor Hugo gave its action almost in the phrase of Suetonius on which it is based:

[1] This amorous sequence recalls the pastoral plots.

ACT I
Titus

ACT II
reginam Berenicen

ACT III
invitus

ACT IV
invitam

ACT V
dimisit.

Such is the action of a Racinian play, which is characterised, as M. Robert shows in his *Poétique de Racine*, by: A simple yet majestic and not improbable story; characters on heroic scale; violence of passions; beauty of sentiments; elegance of expression. All this is consistent with the Scaligerian definition of tragedy, and falls in perfectly with the requirements of the abbé d'Aubignac.

If we turn next to a more detailed consideration of the individual plays, we can divide Racine's dramatic productivity into three periods: the first two plays, those from *Andromaque* to *Phèdre*, and the last two.

La Thébaïde, ou les frères ennemis, and *Alexandre* are distinctly youthful experiments: Racine has not acquired independence, and is content to follow the fashions in vogue. Love is as yet the *galanterie* of society and of romance. In *la Thébaïde*, Creon, the tyrant of Thebes, is the rival of his own son Hémon for Antigone's love, and seven characters of the play meet violent deaths. In *Alexandre* the Macedonian conqueror is but a foolish suitor in love with Cléofile.

With *Andromaque* Racine entered upon his period of glory. It was the time of Molière's masterpieces *Tartuffe*, *Don Juan*, *le Misanthrope*, and poor Corneille was in the period of *Attila*. Racine here definitely strikes out for himself and seeks a realistic portrayal of passion. Hermione is the jealous and neglected

woman seeking revenge, and the problem of the play is the *crime passionnel* frequent in French newspapers today. Racine's contemporaries saw such cases about them; Cléopâtre and Rodogune were similar primal types, and there are likenesses between the plots of *Andromaque* and of *Pertharite*; but this was the first time that the psychology of such a character had been put upon the stage. Andromaque, too, was recognised as a Frenchwoman, with what Nisard called a "coquetterie vertueuse," which, in spite of her fidelity to Hector's memory, made her understand the power of her sex over Pyrrhus. The latter is one of the most interesting characters of the play for a study of the development of male characters. Today this fierce barbarian of Epirus seems a curled Assyrian bull, too much at home in a drawing-room to be realistic. Racine, on the contrary, had to defend his portraiture from the charge of brutality: "Pyrrhus n'avait pas lu nos romans; il était violent de son naturel, et tous les héros ne sont pas faits pour être des Céladons."

Andromaque was quickly followed by *les Plaideurs*, a comedy. It was a light farce based in plot on the *Wasps* of Aristophanes, with hints from Rabelais, Cyrano, Furetière and others, and envenomed by a personal grudge of Racine against the courts because of certain legal tribulations he had undergone. It was developed with some of the horse-play of the Italian comedy, with characters peeping out of unexpected quarters or falling into holes, and themselves reproducing the Italian types: Isabelle and Léandre are of Italian origin even to their names, and l'Intimé is the tricky servant, descended from the slave of Terence who helps his master to dupe the old father. Racine shows in this play that he could have succeeded in comedy had he tried. His sense of satire was keen, and his acrid character made his wit particularly biting.

Britannicus is Racine's *Macbeth*, a play haunted with the premonitions of crime. It is one of the less "popular" of the author's tragedies, but one of his most thorough psychological studies, portraying the determination of crime in Nero, the

anger of Agrippina at the loss of her power, the hypocrisy and intrigues of the evil counsellor Narcisse. Nero is not even the picturesque ruffian of Suetonius and Tacitus, or, to be more modern, of *Quo Vadis*, posing in the circus and burning Christians, and Racine confines himself to the actual contest of weakness against temptation and the resulting defeat.

Bérénice represents the climax of the Racinian method and manner, though it is not usually classed among his best plays.[1] Contemporary spectators saw in it the separation of Louis XIV from Marie Mancini, the niece of Mazarin, or, it was also asserted, the surmised love of Henriette d'Angleterre, supposed to have suggested the play to Racine, for the same king. The drama is, therefore, rather in the strain of tearful elegy than of strong passion. Bérénice, Titus and Antiochus would have seemed like limp dish-rags to Corneille in his doughty days:

> Adieu. Servons tous trois d'exemple à l'univers
> De l'amour la plus tendre et la plus malheureuse
> Dont il puisse garder l'histoire douloureuse.

Yet when, if the legend be true, at Henriette's request Corneille wrote a play on the same subject, without knowing that Racine was engaged on it too, he could only be insipid.

Bérénice ends in tears, *Bajazet* in bloodshed. It is Racine's *Othello*, a drama of jealousy, of which the characters are inscrutable Orientals: Roxane was as mysterious to the French of that time as the Moor of Venice to the English. But, as already suggested, the French even today are prone *in their literature* to look upon woman as the plaything of passion and emotion rather than of reflection, whether she be a primitive barbarian or a twentieth-century *névrosée*. Hence the character of Roxane, jealous and vindictive, stands forth from the rest of the play.

Roxane has her foil in the Monime of *Mithridate*, the gentle and civilised woman surrounded by a half-barbarous people. The play is built upon the elements of love and patriotism. *Iphigénie*

[1] See, on the other hand, M. Michaut's *la Bérénice de Racine*.

rationalises a supernatural story of Greek mythology, and depicts a new Antigone subordinating her love to law and duty, to father and country; a jealous and treacherous rival, Eriphile; a proud father, Agamemnon, wavering between love and the call of the oracle; finally, the wild Achilles bubbling over with pride and stained with slaughter, yet in love. The characteristic contribution of Racine to the story is the part of Eriphile, of whom he said he found the hint in Pausanias, who becomes almost the pivot of the play.

With *Phèdre* we come to the turning-point of Racine's own career. This is the tragedy not only of jealous but of guilty love, or rather the struggle against guilty love; for it must be said in justice to Phèdre that she tries to banish her incestuous desire until she thinks she can love Hippolyte without doing wrong. Taken all in all, *Phèdre* marks the culmination of Racine's studies of passion. The chaste Hippolytus is swept aside from the centre of the play and even becomes the sighing suitor of an *ingénue;* for Racine could scarcely conceive of a hero not in love. "Que diraient les petits-maîtres?" he replied to the Jansenists to justify the presence of the "charmante" Aricie. But Thésée, the king, and Œnone, the wicked nurse, as well as Hippolyte and Aricie, yield to Phèdre, the unhappy and irresponsible woman, the slave of "Vénus tout entière à sa proie attachée."

Strange to say, it was this drama of unchastity which brought about a reconciliation between Racine and his former teachers of Port-Royal, who saw in *Phèdre* a Jansenist play teaching a moral lesson. For it depicts human nature in sin because unillumined by Grace, and the evil passions therefore necessarily triumphant, as in the austere creed of Port-Royal.

This reconciliation alone might justify Racine in giving up tragedies, but there were other predisposing causes. His spiteful character, together with his successes, made him many enemies. On this occasion the duchesse de Bouillon and her brother the duc de Nevers, niece and nephew of Mazarin, with

Mme Deshoulières worked up a conspiracy against him, the "cabale de *Phèdre*." The poetaster Pradon scribbled off a rival *Phèdre*, finished a few days before Racine's and systematically boomed. Meanwhile they sought to damn Racine's play by a conspiracy of silence, and the quarrel degenerated into the "war of the sonnets," a series of most reprehensible productions for which everybody deserves censure.

Whatever the reason, Racine conceived that his plays were evil. His conversion may have resulted partly from bitterness, or it may have been sincere and he may have seen a baneful influence in his own writings. For those were the days of plots and poisonings, of Mme de Brinvilliers and la Voisin; the times when Mme de Montespan sought the infamous Satanic rites of the abbé Guibourg to preserve the king's love; when in spite of the majestic calm which historians of the seventeenth century have tried to throw about the age, jealousy and murder were as rife as they ever have been, and when Racine's own name was by gossip connected with the death of the actress Mlle Du Parc.

For years Racine attended to his family duties and the chronicles of the king's reign. Then at the request of Mme de Maintenon he wrote a biblical idyl or sacred elegy, a combination of dialogue and cantata, called *Esther*. This was acted by the girls of Saint-Cyr, of which school Mme de Maintenon was the directress, in private theatricals before the king and selected guests. It was scarcely looked upon as a regular tragedy, but its lyric beauty pleased literary judges, the religious spirit found favor with Port-Royal and with Mme de Maintenon, who perhaps saw her own fortune in the story of the heroine. Finally, in 1691 Racine gave to Saint-Cyr another religious drama, *Athalie*, drawn from the *Book of Kings*. But he did not bear in mind the limitations of amateur actresses playing in a small room, and rôles like the frenzied Athalie, the fanatical Joad, the wily and treacherous Mathan, the bluff general Abner, were far above their power. Few, except Boileau, recognised

the greatness of the play until it was publicly acted long after the author's death who never saw it properly given.

Today we are justified in terming it Racine's greatest drama and the culmination of French Classicism. His poetry here reaches its supreme melody and harmony, and to the spirit of Christian and Hebrew religion he unites the majesty of the dialogue of Hellenic tragedy and the beauty of its choruses. Sainte-Beuve called the play the "couronnement de Port-Royal," and what speaks in it is, indeed, the spirit of Jehovah, the austerity of Calvinism and of Jansenism, of a jealous God who visits the sins of the fathers upon the children, rather than the friendly deity of Catholicism, whom the French call "le *bon* Dieu."

In this consideration of the theories of Racine and the growth of his plays, little attention has been given to something else which differentiates him from his predecessors and contemporaries. With him the French alexandrine reaches the perfection of combined strength and smoothness. Though using a limited vocabulary and consequently needing to produce his effects by shades of words rather than by richness of language, Racine excels Corneille in his discovery of the proper word. His rhetoric is less vigorous, less declamatory, but it flows more smoothly from the tongue, and his lines cling to the memory with a rhythm so delicate that a changed order or a substituted word turns the verse into prose.[1] Yet Racine does not fall into the weak softness of a Quinault.

The Frenchman sees in Racine the culmination of his Classical school, because to the drama, which is the favorite literary type, Racine contributed beautiful poetry and gave a rational and realistic portrayal of universal or general passions and emotions. He was the great psychological poet and analyser of

[1] If the reader is tempted to make a practical test of Racine's art let him open Rostand's *Aiglon* at the scene in which the *lectrice* reads some verses from *Andromaque* (Act I, sc. vii), and let him note how, amid the stagger and lurch of the modern alexandrine, the smooth flow of Racine's verse seems in its beauty like the proverbial oasis in the desert.

character. His men and women, with slight allowances for custom and civilisation, are thought by his admirers to be men and women indifferently of the past and of today. His plots are carefully constructed works of art, clear and precise in their formulation, logical in their development, and present a single problem or crisis of human nature, treated in accordance with certain technical rules which are not all absolutely necessary, but the observance of which gives an added intellectual delight to the spectator.

Many of these qualities the foreign reader finds it difficult to appreciate. The beauty of the verse is so subtle, the plot, which depends upon inner action expressed in words rather than upon external action such as the romantic Shaksperian drama often presents, is so remote from the Anglo-Saxon mind, that the alien is puzzled. So the admiration of Racine is usually taken on trust, and he is appreciated, unfortunately, only at an advanced stage of one's study.

Racine is so far above his contemporaries that they sink into obscurity. Pradon is remembered only by the incident of *Phèdre*. Thomas Corneille has received credit for his variety and fertility in other chapters. The sugary style of Philippe Quinault (1635–1688) was perhaps not without its effect on Racine himself. He wrote tragedies, and particularly "lyrical tragedies," often mythological, which are significant in the early history of the opera. They contain the sentimental spirit of the pastoral and the novel, and were plays in which, as Boileau said, "Jusqu'à 'je vous hais,' tout s'y dit tendrement."

The drama of Racine thus represents the flowering of the Classical play, but stands almost alone. The productive period is in Corneille's earlier time, and it is in the first half of the seventeenth century that the most vigorous and the most numerous plays are on the whole to be found. Campistron exaggerated the weak and sugary side of Racine. "Sur le Racine éteint le Campistron pullule," to quote Hugo. Temporary successes were won by the *Amasis* of Lagrange-Chancel, author also of

Philippiques or satires against the regent; the *Tyndarides* of Danchet; the *Absalon* of Duché. The best dramatist of all was La Fosse with his *Manlius Capitolinus* and *Thésée*. The former of these plays was an adaptation from the English of Otway's *Venice Preserved*, which itself had been drawn from the abbé de Saint-Réal's historical romance *la Conjuration de Venise*.

In a previous chapter on the seventeenth-century drama mention was made of the earlier history of the opera and ballet under Italian influences and the protection of Mazarin. The first French opera was the *Pomone* of Pierre Perrin in 1671, and Molière and Benserade developed the ballet. Lulli as composer monopolised the music and collaborated not only with Molière in his ballets, but with Quinault in his "lyrical tragedies." Thomas Corneille and Fontenelle wrote operas, and at the beginning of the eighteenth century Houdar de la Motte wrote opera-tragedies and opera-ballets, in which he was looked upon as the successor to Quinault.

CHAPTER XII

MOLIÈRE

JEAN-BAPTISTE POQUELIN (1622–1673) was the son of a *valet tapissier du roi*. His mother died when he was young, his father remarried and the stepmother is more frequent than the mother in Molière's plays. He was brought up by the Jesuits at the Collège de Clermont and began the study of law, but the allurement of the stage had been on him since childhood, when he had watched the Italian actors or the farces of the Hôtel de Bourgogne. In 1643 he gave up his rights to inheritance from his father, and, uniting his fortunes with certain members of a family of actors named Béjart, he took the name of Molière and started the *Illustre Théâtre*. He opened his quarters in a tennis court or shed on the left bank of the river. The company met with disaster, tried in vain to do better in more fashionable regions near the Place Royale, and in 1645 Molière was jailed for debt. So a few months later, he and the Béjarts, in a reorganised company amalgamated with the troupe of Du Fresne, left Paris for a long tour of France. The name of Molière himself disappears for a number of months. The journey lasted for many years. The company was at first a typical band of "barn-stormers," plodding from city to city, giving performances in buildings often ill-suited to the purpose, exposed to the scorn of thrifty but narrow-minded *bourgeois*. It acquired more prestige as Molière gradually became famous. The itinerary of the company is traceable to a certain degree by entries in municipal registers, in nearly all the larger cities of the west and south. But Molière at least was getting training in the study of human nature, for he was brought in much closer

contact than if he had remained in Paris with the various types and classes who are depicted in his comedies. In 1652 the company, now well known, made its headquarters at Lyons, and there, in 1653 or 1655, Molière brought out his first original written comedy, *l'Etourdi*, based upon an Italian original by Niccolò Barbieri. The company had been in the habit of acting tragedies by different authors, but Molière had composed a number of farces on the plan of the *commedia dell'arte*, in which a part of the dialogue was left to the inspiration of the actors. Most of these have disappeared, but their titles sometimes suggest later plays by Molière: *Gorgibus dans le sac* may be a hint of *les Fourberies de Scapin*, and *le Fagotier* of *le Médecin malgré lui*. The two which have survived, *le Médecin volant* and *la Jalousie du Barbouillé*, suggest in their plots *le Médecin malgré lui* and *Georges Dandin* respectively.

In 1656 Molière gave *le Dépit amoureux* at Béziers. He had the distinction of appearing before the prince de Conti, who had been at the Collège de Clermont with Molière, though probably too far above him in rank to notice him, and who was later, as a Jansenist, to be a foe to Molière and his plays. Molière's ambition was to return to Paris. He succeeded in acquiring the patronage of Monsieur, the king's brother, and in 1658 his company appeared before the king in a semi-private performance at the Louvre, playing Corneille's *Nicomède* and *le Dépit amoureux*. Then a public performance was given in November at the Hôtel du Petit-Bourbon, where Molière's company alternated with the Italians, still gaining but little success with plays like *Rodogune* and *Pompée*. It was not until November 18, 1659, that he won instant fame by *les Précieuses ridicules*, with its innovation of modern, almost personal, satire. In 1660 came *Sganarelle*, but enemies came too in the shape of the rival company at the Hôtel de Bourgogne and the friends of those whom Molière had attacked in his *Précieuses*. As a result Molière was unexpectedly ousted from his theatre during the king's absence for his marriage. After a delay for repairs, Molière opened a new

theatre at the Palais-Royal, where Richelieu had played *Mirame*, with the *Dépit amoureux*. This was followed by *Don Garcie de Navarre*, a failure, and by *l'Ecole des maris*, which won an instant success. In 1662, at the age of forty, he made the mistake of marrying a young girl of nineteen, brought up in his company, whose frivolity and coquetry made his life wretched, though his own behavior was no better than that of the other actors of the day. In 1665 his company was allowed to call itself the *troupe du roi*, though the actors at the Hôtel de Bourgogne were still the *troupe royale*. In 1673, after a brief but glorious career saddened by his experience with his wife and by the wasting of constant ill-health, Molière, whose fidelity to duty kept him from leaving his fellow-actors, was by a sort of tragic irony taken with a hæmorrhage of the lungs at the fourth performance of *le Malade imaginaire*, in which he had made a violent attack upon doctors, and died within a few hours.

Molière and his actors gave plays of all kinds, nearly all the chief ones of Corneille, and for the first time *Attila* and *Tite et Bérénice*. They brought out Racine's *Thébaïde* and *Alexandre*, and gave productions by Thomas Corneille, Scarron, Rotrou, Du Ryer, Boisrobert and others. Molière, like many comic actors, would have preferred fame as a tragedian, but he never succeeded very well, and thus he was described by his enemy Montfleury:

> Il est fait tout de même; il vient, le nez au vent,
> Les pieds en parenthèse et l'épaule en avant;
> Sa perruque qui suit le côté qu'il avance,
> Plus pleine de lauriers qu'un jambon de Mayence;
> Les mains sur les côtés, d'un air peu négligé,
> La tête sur le dos comme un mulet chargé,
> Les yeux fort égarés; puis débitant ses rôles,
> D'un hoquet éternel sépare ses paroles.

From the point of view of actual influences Molière, to use the familiar phrase, "prenait son bien où il le trouvait." Rules were a very secondary matter to him, and all sources were good

if the result was a snappy comedy. The old *fabliaux* and farces indirectly contributed suggestions of plots, comedies by his predecessors from Larivey down gave him many a scene, Latin comedy was a model, the spirit of the Spanish play was in line with his farces. But, above all, he underwent the influence of Italian comedy both in its written and spoken forms. From it he took plots, very fully at first, then only incidents and scenes, as well as types of pedants, valets, soubrettes, harlequins and scaramouches, and names like Pandolfe, Mascarille, Scapin, Léandre, Valère, Horace, Isabelle and Zerbinette.

The *étourdi* of the play of that name is the "scatter-brained fellow," the "Sir Martin Mar-all" of Dryden, of which play Pepys recorded that he never laughed so in all his life. The hero Lélie, with the help of his tricky valet Mascarille, wants to get possession of the woman he loves, but each time that Mascarille devises a plot, he spoils it by his *étourderie*, either revealing it too soon or to the wrong person. Or when he is instructed to tell a story he mixes up places: "En Turquie à Turin." Mascarille is the tricky servant, proud of his cleverness:

> Après ce rare exploit, je veux que l'on s'apprête
> A me peindre en héros un laurier sur la tête,
> Et qu'au bas du portrait on mette en lettres d'or:
> *Vivat Mascarillus, fourbûm imperator!*

The *Dépit amoureux*, also largely of Italian origin from a play by Niccolò Secchi, contains a form of the old travesty of a girl disguised as a boy which Shakspere used in *Twelfth Night* and *As You Like It*. The value of the play really comes from the scene of a lovers' tiff, such as Molière used later in *Tartuffe*. In another traditional scene master and mistress are imitated in a still more humorous tone by man and maid.

Both *l'Etourdi* and *le Dépit amoureux* fade into insignificance before *les Précieuses ridicules*, a one-act farce. Molière made a bold stroke for success, and got what he wanted. He was not, it will be remembered, absolutely free from the figures of speech

of preciosity himself, and has given permanence to more than one. But he hits a blow at foolish provincial women like those whom Chapelle and Bachaumont in their *Voyage* saw at Montpellier, and indirectly at the preciosity of Paris. Two gentlemen, rejected in marriage by the ignorant and affected girls Cathos and Madelon, because they do not make love according to the novels of Mlle de Scudéry, send their servants Mascarille and Jodelet disguised as noblemen to court the damsels. The vulgarity of the domestics passes for breeding, and the girls are dazzled by the fine language of the *ruelles précieuses* until a rude awakening comes. The satire in this play of the occupations of society did more than anything else to bring preciosity to the ground.

Molière's enemies were already numerous, and though Sganarelle, in the play of that name, a character who henceforth replaces Mascarille, was a success, *Don Garcie de Navarre* in 1661 fell flat. It was too serious and high-flown, though not more so than many romantic plays of the time, and strangely enough it was rather *précieux*, but Molière used certain parts of it later in *le Misanthrope*.

L'Ecole des maris (1661) brought new fame. The plot goes back ultimately to the Adelphi of Terence, with incidents which may be traced to Boccaccio, to Lope de Vega, to Hurtado de Mendoza, partly through Boisrobert and Dorimond. The brothers Ariste and Sganarelle bring up two girls to be their wives. Sganarelle, the jealous taskmaster, is the one to be deceived by his tricky *protégée*, whereas the older but kindly Ariste reaps the reward of happiness.

There came next in the same year *les Fâcheux*, given at Fouquet's great festival at Vaux just a few weeks before his arrest, and in it Molière makes use for the first time of the ballet. It is what the French call a *pièce à tiroirs*, a series of disconnected scenes and character studies depicting various kinds of bores and nuisances who might well be underground and who never would be missed. There is the *petit marquis* who interrupts the play, the gambler, the bragging huntsman (this character at the

king's suggestion), the pedant Caritidès, who, unwilling to be a "savant en us" like his fellow-pedants, decided to be a Greek "savant en ès." Molière acted the transformation characters of these successive *fâcheux*.

L'Ecole des femmes (1662) was, on the whole, the most popular success of Molière's career. Its topic is to a certain extent that of *l'Ecole des maris*. Arnolphe, a middle-aged and in those days elderly man of forty, has trained the *ingénue* Agnès to be his wife, as Sganarelle educated Isabelle. The result is the same, though Agnès sins through lamblike ignorance and innocence, and the moral is the familiar one concerning youth and crabbed age. Molière had himself just married Armande Béjart, and critics fond of parallels have pointed out the coincidence, though it seems unlikely that Molière would so soon have foreseen his own troubles, or even so have proclaimed them. The *motif* of the play is an old one and appears in Italian and Spanish tales. Molière perhaps borrowed a story of Maria de Zayas y Sotomayor, *El prevenido engañado*. Scarron's *la Précaution inutile* and Dorimond's *l'Ecole des cocus, ou la Précaution inutile* are forms of the same story, which has given titles or subtitles to authors down to Beaumarchais. Pepys says, on reading *The Fruitless Precaution* in English: "And so home, where I fell to read '*The Fruitless Precaution*' (a book formerly recommended by Dr. Clerke at sea to me), which I read in bed till I had made an end of it, and do find it the best writ tale that ever I read in my life."

Molière's enemies, *fâcheux*, *précieux*, pedants and prudes, said that *l'Ecole des femmes* was prurient and indecent by its suggestions, as well as irreligious because its maxims of marriage were a parody of saintly writers (Gregory Nazianzen). Molière answered them by a short comedy, *la Critique de l'Ecole des femmes*, which, like the *Frogs* of Aristophanes, is a literary play. Apart from its own brilliancy the comedy is valuable as giving what Molière scarcely otherwise took the trouble to formulate, his theory of comedy: to please and to copy from nature.

"Lorsque vous peignez les hommes il faut peindre d'après nature. On veut que ces portraits ressemblent; et vous n'avez rien fait, si vous n'y faites reconnaître les gens de votre siècle." Molière aims, then, to be a realist henceforth as opposed to the writers of fantastic and unreal romantic plays or burlesque comedies. Without going out of his way to violate the technical rules he snaps his fingers at them: "Je voudrais bien savoir si la grande règle de toutes les règles n'est pas de plaire, et si une pièce de théâtre qui a attrapé son but n'a pas suivi un bon chemin."

The contest is continued in *l'Impromptu de Versailles* (1663), aimed especially against the actors of the Hôtel de Bourgogne whose friends Donneau de Vizé and Boursault had attacked Molière in plays. Here the action takes place, not in a drawing-room, but on the stage of Molière's own theatre among his actors and actresses. While rehearsing a play Molière finds opportunity to parody some of his rivals and to restate his theory: "L'affaire de la comédie est de représenter en général tous les défauts des hommes, et principalement des hommes de notre siècle." Molière thus accepts the traditional view of the moral purpose of comedy (*castigare ridendo mores*), though we may ask ourselves privately whether he took that aim very seriously. In acting the effort should be towards simplicity and naturalness. Molière could not be sufficiently sarcastic at the bombastic declamatory style in vogue at the Hôtel de Bourgogne, though it is plain that in tragedy at least the diction there met with greater favor at the time than did Molière's style. The actors of the Hôtel de Bourgogne did not consider themselves defeated, and through the mouthpiece of Vizé, Villiers and Montfleury retorted with the most shameful personal abuse.

After a trifling but amusing comedy-ballet, *le Mariage forcé*, in 1664, Molière, now high in favor with the king, wrote *la Princesse d'Elide* for the series of fantastic entertainments, *les Plaisirs de l'Ile enchantée*, which the king offered to his mistress

Mlle de la Vallière. Such was the haste with which Molière had to compose his play that the beginning only was in verse. On one of the later days of the festival Molière played the first three acts of one of his greatest comedies, *Tartuffe*.

This play pictures the hypocrite, and belongs to the series of types which French literature gives from the Faux-Semblant of the *Roman de la Rose* and the fox of the *Roman de Renart*, through the Panurge of Rabelais and the Macette of Regnier, to the M. de Climal of Marivaux, the don Basile of Beaumarchais, the Rodin of Eugène Sue. And who is not familiar with such English characters as Joseph Surface, or the Pecksniffs, Chadbands and Uriah Heeps of Dickens? Tartuffe is a religious hypocrite as well, and the play must have had its *actualité*, though it is not easy to say whom Molière was attacking. He was by temperament and training a foe to rule and restraint: he belonged to a profession against which the clergy thundered as immoral and which did constantly violate the ordinances of the Church; he had been brought into contact when young with the theories of the *libertins*, accustomed to justify physical pleasures and, like Rabelais, to look upon Nature as good; he was constantly goaded by the criticism of those who called his plays indecent. So it need not be wondered at that Molière was irreligious in his attitude, though he had friends among the clergy. It is a futile task to decide whether he was trying in the play to represent a real man, and a thankless one to turn it into an attack upon a single sect. The allusions to the doctrines of casuistry and the subsidiary forms of equivocation and mental restrictions point to the Jesuits: the attitude of Tartuffe towards entertainments and personal adornments hints at the Jansenists; the frequent mention of a cabal may stand for the secret Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement or "Cabale des dévots" which worked in secret and devious ways against the foes of the Catholic religion. M. Brunetière, therefore, among others, called the play an onslaught on Christianity. It is much simpler to accept Molière's word that he is attacking religious hypocrites of all

kinds, and to take the play as a document in defence as much as an attack.

But the clergy did take it as an attack against them all, and the king, though friendly to Molière, felt constrained to forbid the performances. Molière finished the play and gave private readings, to Cardinal Chigi the papal legate, among others. He toned down the rôle of Tartuffe, as a *directeur de conscience*, from a priest to a layman, changed his name to Panulphe and tried to bring out the comedy as a new one named *l'Imposteur* in 1667. This was again forbidden by the judge, M. de Lamoignon, a petition to the king remained fruitless, and it was not until 1669 that the play was finally allowed and was acted in its present form. Meanwhile Molière had brought out a series of plays: *Don Juan* (1665), *l'Amour médecin*, *le Misanthrope* (1666), *le Médecin malgré lui*, *Mélicerte*, *la Pastorale comique*, *le Sicilien*, *Amphitryon* (1668), *Georges Dandin*, *l'Avare* (1668).

Tartuffe contains borrowings from previous writers, such as Scarron, Sorel and Du Lorens, but it is, on the whole, the most original play so far written by Molière, and as a character study comes into the great Classical school to which Molière, in spite of his apparent independence, belonged. Goethe admired the art with which the first two acts converge towards the appearance of Tartuffe, who, though he does not appear until the third act, dominates the play; we all marvel at the way comedy and tragedy are blended, and Tartuffe, though he disgusts by the realism with which his character is set before us, is none the less a comic type.

If *Tartuffe* is an attack upon Christianity, in *Don Juan* Molière certainly did not present the happy results of atheism. But the play does continue the religious controversy marked by *Tartuffe*. Molière took a subject which had arisen in Spain, but had won success in Italian plays and in French comedies by Dorimond and Villiers at the Hôtel de Bourgogne a few years before. He made his hero, however, not merely a heedless libertine and unbeliever, but he strengthened the atheism of

his predecessors until it dominated the play, and the hero utters the deep and bitter philosophy of one who denies. Don Juan is no longer merely the "inconstant Hylas," or even a reprobate of genius like Benvenuto Cellini. Rather like Retz he could say "Je pris le parti de faire le mal par dessein," or he was a Lovelace that literature was to produce and a Casanova that time was actually to bring forth.

It is the complexity of Don Juan's behavior that made him a puzzle to the French and a fascinating figure to later writers. At the same time it is one of Molière's hardest rôles to play, hence the ambition but the despair of actors. The spectators of the Classical age were bewildered by a play, really a tragi-comedy, in which the unities were neglected, and containing magic, fantasy and buffoonery. The thinker was allured by the almost impossible task of analysing the haughtiness and arrogance of Don Juan, his base villainy, his hypocrisy. But it remained for a German, Christian Grabbe, to pit Faust and Don Juan against each other in a play as rivals in love.

In *l'Amour médecin* Molière begins the attack against physicians as hidebound conservatives and pedants which he is to continue in *le Médecin malgré lui* and *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*, and which will culminate in *le Malade imaginaire*. *Mélicerte* is an unreality, a "comédie pastorale héroïque," borrowed from the *Grand Cyrus* of Molière's victim Mlle de Scudéry, the *Pastorale comique* is a fragment, *le Sicilien* a pretty trifle in rhythmic prose. *Le Misanthrope*, on the other hand, vies with *Tartuffe* and *Don Juan* for the primacy among Molière's plays. It is the perfect type of Classical comedy in form, and presents a study of character and of manners, wherein amid the environment of a French society life we witness the workings of a problem in the psychology of the hero's mind. The outer plot is of little consequence.

In this play Molière returns to the seriousness of *Don Garcie de Navarre*, and in many a passage borders on tragedy. His own life, saddened by hostile criticism, ill-health and an unhappy

marriage, had become embittered, and literary detectives have tried to prove that the treatment of Alceste by the young coquette Célimène was an echo of Molière's own married life. Be that as it may, *le Misanthrope* is Molière's nearest approach to tragedy, however much it may have been acted by him in the comic vein. The grumbling of Alceste often irritates, his bluntness offends, in the discussion of courtesy versus sincerity we sympathise more with the pleasant Philinte and we are apt to term Alceste a *mauvais coucheur* rather than a misanthrope. The hastily written and involved language is also a drawback to its appreciation by the foreigner. But in a comparison between *le Misanthrope* and Wycherly's imitation the *Plain Dealer* the difference is seen between genius and brutality, and in Alceste's associates we have wonderful portraits of the men and women of the time: *petits marquis* or Fopling Flutters, coquettes and gossips like Célimène and Arsinoé.

Amphitryon is a reproduction of the old comedy of Plautus which Shakspere used in the *Comedy of Errors* and which Rotrou had imitated in *les Sosies*. *Georges Dandin* is a bitter comedy dealing with unhappy marriage, though no parallel can be drawn with Molière and Armande. *L'Avare*, no less bitter, is a study of the miser and the dissensions which avarice brings into a family. It is ultimately based on the *Aulularia* of Plautus, with many borrowings from later comedies. The humor of this play has an acrid taste, and there is hardly a sympathetic person in it. Father and children play a game of mutual deceit, and the forms which his passion takes are so grotesque that he does not produce loathing, as with the père Grandet, or pity, as with Silas Marner, but merely amusement, — probably what Molière intended.

Monsieur de Pourceaugnac, a comedy-ballet, mocks the untravelled provincial who comes to Paris, and sets up to ridicule, as Rabelais did in his "écolier limousin," the inhabitants of Limoges, where Molière may have had some disagreeable experience. *La comtesse d'Escarbagnas*, a somewhat

later play, is a companion portrait of the provincial lady of quality.

Meanwhile, after a trifling play called *les Amants magnifiques*, came *le Bourgeois gentilhomme*, the perfection of farce, containing also elements of comedy of character and of manners. M. Jourdain, the vulgar *bourgeois* who wishes to associate with his betters in rank, is an amusing combination of M. Perrichon for conceit and of M. Poirier for ambition.[1] *Psyché* was written in combination with Corneille and Quinault. In *les Fourberies de Scapin* Molière modernises the *Phormio* of Terence under the influence of Italian comedy: the slave becomes the tricky valet, the scene is at Naples, we hear of Turkish pirates and witness a good deal of the stage-business of the *commedia dell'arte*.

Les Femmes savantes brings us back to the satire of women. The preciosity of Mlle de Scudéry is now a less burning question than the pedantry of blue-stockings, and the learned coteries of the end of the seventeenth century troubled Molière more than the ignorance of *ingénues* like Agnès. Consequently he shows us the household of the worthy but weak-minded Parisian Chrysale, where all the women but one are crazy for knowledge and neglect household duties to discuss poetry and philosophy. The exception, Henriette, is Molière's favorite among young girls: she is intelligent and witty, but more anxious to marry and have a home and children than to espouse pure philosophy.

Finally, Molière's last comedy, *le Malade imaginaire*, is a fierce attack by the dying writer, on the ignorant physicians whose archaic theories and methods were unavailing in his own own case.

A Frenchman will tell you that Molière is the greatest humorist of all times and will, as a rule, unhesitatingly place him above Shakspere. For this there is some justification: Shakspere has explored a whole realm of consciousness that Molière has merely skirted, but in pure comedy he certainly does not excel

[1] *Le Voyage de Monsieur Perrichon* of Labiche; *le Gendre de Monsieur Poirier* of Augier.

Molière. The French writer's chief defect is repetition and monotony: he harps too much on the same things, and his minor characters, at least, reappear too often under different names but in the same predicaments. Yet as a painter of the foibles of his age Molière is unsurpassed.

We may turn to him, therefore, as well as to any writer of his times to get a picture of seventeenth-century civilisation from one whose life, up from the *bourgeoisie* through the experiences of a travelling actor to royal favor, had given him the best opportunities of observation. There is bitterness in his view of men. A husband or father is apt to be cruel (Harpagon), or a dupe (Organ, Argan, M. Jourdain), or a weakling (Dandin, Chrysale). A woman is treacherous (Isabelle in *l'Ecole des maris*, Dorimène, Frosine, Béline), or a fool (Bélise, the comtesse d'Escarbagnas, Cathos, Madelon). Old people in particular are his butt (Arnolphe, Harpagon, Argon, Géronte, Argante). The young are more sympathetic, though their romance ends with the wedding day. Intelligence is likely to be found rather in the minor characters, the tricky valet (Mascarille of *l'Etourdi*, Scapin), the impudent but sensible maid-servant or *suivante* (Toinette, Martine, Dorine), the heavy but well-advised brother or brother-in-law called a *raisonneur* (Cléante, Ariste), what the irreverent modern world calls a bore or *raseur*.

Nevertheless, in spite of the necessary exaggeration of the dramatist, Molière the realist shows us the coquette, the gossip, the prude, intriguers, pedants, the corrupt or ignorant nobility and gentry, silly *bourgeois* and *bourgeoises*, an endless array of portraits. His virulence is concentrated on those who had done him most harm (snobbish and jealous courtiers), and those who had done him no good (doctors). In the *Fâcheux*, the *Critique de l'Ecole des femmes*, the *Misanthrope*, Molière tears to pieces the beaux, the bores and the boors of Versailles, and in play after play he makes onslaughts on the givers of rhubarb and senna, the advocates of purge and clyster, whose knowledge is based on Aristotle, Hippocrates and Galen.

Thus we see Molière's theory to be to give pleasure by a realistic or humorously exaggerated picture of the weaknesses of mankind. His own attitude varies slightly: at times, as in *le Bourgeois gentilhomme*, he merely bubbles over with humor, at other times there is an after-taste of bitterness or of sadness which is the reflection of Molière's own existence. The comedy may end with a happy marriage, but the author cannot do away with the consciousness of the knavery of humanity. Molière's life was saddened by constant disappointment and illness: it is not to be wondered at that his drama is affected by this. It was the tragedy of life amid its comedy that he tried to show in his three greatest plays, *Tartuffe*, *Don Juan* and *le Misanthrope*, which appear between earlier and later stages of farces and light plays.

Molière from first to last turned against the ideal and towards the realities of the world. His favorite woman is the ordinary Henriette who is quite willing to be *bête*, or the sensible but unpoetical Eliante. He cannot be too sarcastic against those who soar after ideals like Cathos and Madelon, or *chimères* like Bélise. Even religion is to Molière a useful safeguard rather than an ennobling element of life, and Nature much as Rabelais interpreted it is life's guiding principle.

CHAPTER XIII

BOILEAU. THE QUARREL OF THE ANCIENTS AND MODERNS

BOILEAU performs for the literature of Classicism the task that was done by Sebillet, Peletier and Vauquelin de la Fresnaye in the sixteenth century. He expounds the theory of poetry at the culmination of the great school, and does so with such authority as to be called by his countrymen "le législateur du Parnasse." To the Romanticists he seemed the embodiment of all that was flat, dull and prosaic; to the Classicists he was dignity, measure, reason, taste.

The biography is brief. Nicolas Boileau (1636–1711), called by his contemporaries Despréaux to distinguish him from his brothers, was a *bourgeois* of Paris by birth, residence and disposition. He has been charged with bringing down literature from heaven to earth and making it sink from the aristocratic heights of the Hôtel de Rambouillet and the soaring strain of Balzac to the level of common people. After Boileau there was place for pedantry, but not for the romantic and emotional in which Mlle de Scudéry delighted. His family was connected in a small way with the courts, where his father was a clerk. Boileau's mother died when he was two years old and he had no knowledge of maternal love. He was destined for the Church and then for the law, but he gave up both plans, and after his father's death, in 1657, he lived in quiet independence to the end of his days. He remained unmarried, having no sentiment in his nature, was thrifty though not miserly, and cultivated men of wit and taste like himself: Racine, Molière, La Fontaine, Furetière, Chapelle. He passed his time in writing, in dining at the taverns to meet his friends, and was not averse to knowing

the border people between austerity and license, la Champmeslé, Ninon de Lenclos.

Boileau gradually earned the king's goodwill, he received pensions, was appointed with Racine historiographer of the reign, became member of the Academy, a friend of the Président de Lamoignon and the serious set. In his maturity he turned towards Jansenism, not so far as the dogma was concerned, but to its morals, which he contrasted with the subtlety of the Jesuits. His old age was saddened by loneliness and infirmities, deafness and dropsy, as well as by disputes with the Jesuits. In spite of the bitter sting of Boileau's satire it need not be thought that he was morose. On the contrary, with his friends he was cheerful and kind.

Sainte-Beuve divides Boileau's career into three periods: the time of bold and boisterous satire before 1669, then a mature and critical stage to 1677, and finally, after the interruption caused by his duties as historiographer, the inferior old age. His chief writings are the *Satires*, the *Epistles*, the *Art poétique*, the mock-heroic *Lutrin*, and a number of epigrams and odes, including that unfortunate bit of Pindarism satirised by Prior, the *Ode sur la prise de Namur*.

In prose he wrote the *Dialogue sur les héros de roman* which we have alluded to so often, a *Dissertation sur Joconde*, a translation of Longinus on the *Sublime* with critical reflections, and a number of letters, especially to Racine and Brossette.

Boileau, who was glad to be thought the modern Horace[1] and whose chief works correspond to the *genres* of the Roman poet, satires, epistles, art of poetry, was the author in whom formal

[1] Cf. Regnard's epitaph for Boileau:

Ci-gît maître Boileau, qui vécut de médire,
Et qui mourut aussi par un trait de satire:
Le coup dont il frappa lui fut enfin rendu.
Si par malheur un jour son livre était perdu,
A le chercher bien loin, passant, ne t'embarrasse:
Tu le retrouveras tout entier dans Horace.

satire and criticism culminate in French literature. He was a moralist as well as an æsthetic critic. In the former rôle he was the literary friend of Port-Royal, and the reading of Boileau was popularly said to be the only diversion the worthy Jansenists allowed themselves. He was at variance with them concerning the drama, but he despised their common foes the Jesuits, and the melancholy of his last years has a Jansenist tinge. His last satire, *De l'Equivoque*, though poor in itself, is wholly in the spirit of Port-Royal.

As a critic, Boileau is the type of the French genius in a narrow yet superior sense, when the reason is more trained than the imagination. He has but little appreciation for the romance of poetry, but preaches constantly clearness, precision, truth. He continues the work of Malherbe, brings verse and prose together, and promotes the realism of the Classical school.

Boileau's theory is based on his *bourgeois* and somewhat narrow character, and was more useful in his own day than it might have been at other periods. He hated the bombast of the Spanish school, the floweriness of Italian Marinism, the fantasy of Mlle de Scudéry and the *précieuses*, the exaggerations of the burlesques. In all these forms of expression he detected the lack of measure and of restraint. To give these qualities to literature was the task he undertook, and in so doing he was a judicious friend and critic of Molière and helped to form the taste of Racine and of La Fontaine. He took as guide "Reason." By its help he judged and classified the various forms of poetry, trying them by the tests of clearness, accuracy, logic. All these qualities are supremely rational and may be said to belong to the domain of "universal reason." But the necessary consequence is an unimaginative and prosaic poetry, dealing with the same problems of investigation and analysis as prose, becoming in personal literature psychological, convinced that the study of mankind is man, trying to be truthful and in conformity with Nature.

But this Nature, as just suggested, must, like Reason, be

taken in a limited sense. Boileau is a Cartesian in his use of reason, a populariser of the *Discours de la méthode* in the emphasis he gives to arrangement, accuracy, clearness. In practice he applies it as a *bourgeois* of Paris.

Nature is not, then, universal nature with its mountains, its solitude and all that inspires in man a feeling of vagueness and of the infinite: all that is at the bottom of modern lyricism and of romantic poetry in general. Nature is to him human nature or man. And the universality of Boileau's Classicism is that he tries to study the general man with his general qualities, and not what is individual and particular: Man, rather than *a* man. This is why the Romanticists found Classicism dull and tedious, a literature of commonplaces and of general maxims, such as:

Que la nature donc soit votre étude unique;

and,

Jamais de la nature il ne faut s'écarter.

Boileau's man, moreover, is not a man of all times and ages, but the one he knew best and thought he recognised among the ancients, the man of civilised life, the "urbane" Roman, or the Frenchman of Versailles and of Paris:

Etudiez la cour, et connaissez la ville.

In all this is seen the *bourgeois* element, the failure to appreciate the poetical. Besides, the reason which is to judge is also a limited reason, that of Boileau, or at most of "common-sense."

Literature is, then, the expression of reason acting on an imitation of nature. The more this imitation is guided by good sense, the more closely it will approximate nature, be true and have the perfection of beauty. Then we shall have the equation of the true, the beautiful, and the good, τὸ ἀληθές = τὸ εὖ = τὸ καλόν:

Rien n'est beau que le vrai, le vrai seul est aimable.

Moreover, the inspiration of genius alone is not enough, but continual application is necessary also:

Vingt fois sur le métier remettez votre ouvrage,
Polissez-le sans cesse et le repolissez.

The final consequence of effort well applied is the noble, dignified style of Classicism:

Quoi que vous écriviez, évitez la bassesse.

And the best model to Boileau is the one that aroused the admiration of the sixteenth-century Humanists, the ancients, because truths and passions are identical at all ages.

The formula of Boileau fully stated is then:

Reason, or good sense, guided especially by the precepts of antiquity, studies nature or human nature or man, particularly the civilised man of the court and of Paris. The more careful and realistic the study, the more it will be exact, true, natural, and the more the results will be beautiful. The realism or "naturalism" of Boileau usually includes the ordinary and insignificant, not the ugly and vile.[1]

The value of Boileau's work is in defining the theory of Classicism so clearly that it became a model for Europe. His defect was a narrowness in the conception of man and of nature. Yet he did, on the whole, distinguish the good from the bad, and with few exceptions his judgments have been ratified: most of his "victims," though with some notable exceptions like Ronsard, deserve their fate.

The *Art poétique* dogmatically enunciates in four cantos the theory and the rules of poetry. The first canto deals with general ideas such as we have analysed, the second reviews the minor *genres*, the third expounds the three great ones, tragedy, epic, and comedy, the fourth sets forth various general maxims and moral truths. By Boileau's time tragi-comedy had disappeared, but curiously enough he neglected didactic poetry (of which his poem is an example), the epistle which he cultivated, and the fable and verse-tale such as made his friend La Fontaine famous. Lyric poetry, including the elegy, the ode and the sonnet, are all reduced to secondary types.

Tragedy, according to Boileau, in order to win the approval

[1] Cf., however, *le Repas ridicule.*

of "tout Paris," must please and touch, it must have a good exposition, follow the unities, be *vraisemblable* and increase in interest towards an unexpected climax. It may within bounds portray love, the heroes must be neither too good nor too bad, it should respect good manners and good morals, and in diction avoid over-emphasis. This conception is not Hellenic but French, and the working out of its details excludes even parts of Corneille.

The epic is conceived more narrowly still. It is the narrative of a long action "soutenue de fable et de fiction." The virtues shall be personified in order to interest and to instruct, the mysteries of the Christian faith must not be employed as the trappings of poetry, but must be replaced by the *merveilleux païen*. Here the Jansenist speaks, believing religion too lofty for profane verse. The hero must be "en valeur éclatant, en vertus magnifique," the subject simple, the narrative lively, the descriptions rich and noble. Above all, continual toil is needed. Boileau in this conception fails utterly to understand an epic such as the *Iliad* or the *Chanson de Roland*. He sees only the learned epics of his own day, not one of which has survived.

Comedy is a study of human nature, its passions and ages, as witnessed at court and in town. It must be noble and avoid the buffoonery into which even Molière sometimes fell. It must be well constructed, after the pattern of Terence, and should please by reason alone.

Apart from the *Art poétique* the value of Boileau's works to the *modern* reader is comparatively small. His other writings have become nearly obsolete, except sundry passages which reiterate or illustrate the theory of the *Art poétique*, or which are interesting because of their allusions to his contemporaries. Moreover, their intrinsic merit is uneven.

The *Satires* endeavor to continue Horace and Juvenal. At times they illustrate the theory of application and toil; at times they express the moralist viewing the follies of mankind; at times they are purely descriptive of bores and nuisances; at

times, again, Boileau tries to reproduce Juvenal's attacks on women. In his satires Boileau is eminently the *bourgeois* realist.

The *Epîtres* are somewhat more personal, either giving us information about Boileau himself or about those to whom he writes. Mingled with flattery of the king and encomiums on his military campaigns are epistles, such as that to Racine on the value of enemies, that on the beauty of truth (significant for the study of Boileau's æsthetics), or the praise of a quiet life.

The *Lutrin* is a mock-heroic poem, the antithesis of Scarron's method of travesty, and belongs to the category of Tassoni's *Secchia rapita* and Pope's *Rape of the Lock*. In this poem Boileau relates in the style of Virgil a petty squabble which arose between some minor officials of the Sainte-Chapelle over the position of a lectern or reading-desk.

Boileau was rather a critic than a poet, but he felt it necessary to use verse because his model Horace had done so. To the neophyte in French his lines have the monotony which some people discover in Boileau's English equivalent, Pope. To the Romanticist, or the emotionalist in general, his theories appear hackneyed commonplaces in verse, lacking even the swing of a jingling metre. To these criticisms we answer that Boileau did not make claim to be a great poet, and was quite frank in acknowledging his troubles in finding rhymes or building a verse. And, though the ideas for which he stood are partly obsolete in modern literature, yet they stood the test of time and for many years imposed themselves on all intellectual Europe.

Among the cut-and-dried critics of the seventeenth century, famous only in their own day, like Mambrun, Rapin, Bouhours or Le Bossu, one other, Saint-Evremond, stands out prominently near Boileau. Charles de Saint-Denis, sieur de Saint-Evremond (1613–1703), was during his early life a distinguished soldier and man of letters. Obliged to flee from France in 1661 for political reasons, he after a while settled definitely in London, where he remained nearly half a century and was buried in

Westminster Abbey. So, not only is he important in French criticism along with Chapelain and Boileau, but he has his place in the study of the relations of France and England. He was the guiding spirit of the duchesse de Mazarin's set in London and knew all the prominent Englishmen of the time.

Saint-Evremond wrote a great deal: letters, historical and literary judgments, observations and dissertations. He was far less dogmatic than Boileau and did not pride himself so much on being a theorist as a gentleman of letters. In feeling he kept to the end of his life a preference for the literature which he had known when he lived in France, the taste for Corneille rather than Racine. But he was a discerning critic, having, in spite of compliance with the then necessary treatment of critical elements such as Judgment and Taste as though they were Scholastic entities, some of the tendencies which incline to impressionism. He had the scepticism of the libertines in its literary aspect, with good-natured irony and sarcasm. There is no complete modern edition of Saint-Evremond's works, and, in his lifetime, much false material was manufactured and attributed to the absent writer by unscrupulous French publishers, but he is one of those who most deserve attention in the new study of French criticism.

The Quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns is one of the important manifestations of the intellectual activity of the Classical period, and the discussion had its echo in other countries and at other times. It was to be expected that the exponents of Classicism, continuing the traditions handed on from the sixteenth century, should proclaim the greatness of the masterpieces of Greece and Rome. Boileau, seeing the effect of the cult of antiquity in the works of his friend Racine, would be more than likely to find among the ancients the models for imitation.

But the "lawgiver of Parnassus" did not have it all his own way, for there had arisen in the seventeenth century a group of writers proclaiming the value of their own period and its right to hold its own against the great men of the past. They were,

however, consciously or not, followers of one who represented in logical method, in psychology and, indirectly, in æsthetics, the ideas of Classicism, namely, Descartes. The general alignment of forces involved, too, the amusing position in which Boileau found himself of praising the Ancients to the detriment of the Moderns, among whom he was one of the most important.

Descartes was the great representative of the rationalism which was so important a part of the Classical theory. But the rationalism of Descartes was not supported by the cult of antiquity, and relied for its foundation on the independence of the thinker. As a consequence, Descartes was no worshipper of Greece and of Rome, and feigned to scorn the study of the dead languages. Similarly, Malebranche, after him, desired to sweep away all that the past supplied in order that the thinker might construct a new edifice from the beginnings.

The men of the seventeenth century were more ready than we perhaps imagine to side against the past. The Classicism of that age was not as all-pervading as past historians have made out. For us Racine and Boileau overshadow the age more than they did for jealous rivals. The Latinism of the Jesuits, even much of the Hellenism of the Jansenists, were marked modifications from the antique view of life.

In its various concrete forms the quarrel is one ever under discussion. Modern educational theories are full of the rivalry of the ancient and the modern languages and literatures, and of proclamations of the cultural value of scientific as opposed to literary study.

To a considerable degree it is precisely this scientific attitude which accounts for many of the truths and fallacies in the position of the Moderns. Starting from the assumption of Descartes of the power of reason to progress in the construction and synthesis of thought, they believed that of necessity each age must be superior to those which have gone before because it possesses their knowledge and yet more besides. In the eighteenth century, a scientific age, this theory acquired still more

vogue in the belief which then existed in the indefinite perfectibility of man. But the theory is, as a matter of fact, truly applicable only to science. It appeals to those who understand how an invention may constantly be perfected. It is not a sufficient explanation of artistic superiority, or of those intellectual manifestations which go under the name of art rather than science. Art, not being mere accumulated and classified knowledge, depends on the excellence of a genius "qui n'a souvent qu'une voie" or upon the appropriate union of qualitative rather than of quantitative elements. It is perfectly plausible to argue that the Greeks were greater artists than the moderns and their culture superior, and to oppose fixed standards to relativity and constant change.

One of the first in France in the seventeenth century to take up arms in favor of the moderns was Richelieu's factotum the abbé de Boisrobert, who, without any appreciation of the deeper philosophical questions involved, in 1635 at one of the early meetings of the newly created Academy, delivered a tirade against antiquity. Boisrobert's attack was followed a score of years later by those of Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin, who in sundry writings, especially in his *Délices de l'esprit* (1658), was led by his religious conventionalities to cast opprobrium on the pagan literature of antiquity. The concrete form which the views of Saint-Sorlin took may be inferred from some of his verses:

> Nous qui d'invention ayant nos sources pleines,
> Dédaignons de puiser aux antiques fontaines,
> Nous parlons un langage et plus noble et plus beau
> Que ce triste latin qu'on tire du tombeau.

Saint-Sorlin is ready to condemn the ancient poets brought face to face with the modern ones, and to him Malherbe, Balzac or Voiture are the masters:

> De Balzac l'éloquence et si noble et si pure
> Charmera toujours l'avenir,
> Et jamais par les ans les grâces de Voiture
> Ne pourront se ternir.

Many other writers, including the abbé de Bourzeys, and the P. Bouhours, that distinguished Jesuit imbued with all the florid modernity of the order in its literary manifestations, took part in the discussion of the relative merits of the Ancients and Moderns. But the dispute assumed a more violent form in 1687 with the poem read before the Academy by Charles Perrault on the *Siècle de Louis le Grand.* It was this poem which contained the famous lines:

> Je vois les anciens sans plier les genoux:
> Ils sont grands, il est vrai, mais hommes comme nous;
> Et l'on peut comparer, sans crainte d'être injuste,
> Le siècle de Louis au beau siècle d'Auguste.

Boileau, in a passion, sprang to the rescue of an offended antiquity and heaped sarcasm on the growing party of Moderns in the Academy, the *Topinamboux* as he called them. Fontenelle and his uncle Thomas Corneille with the *Mercure galant* took rank with the Moderns, La Bruyère with the Ancients. Fontenelle in his *Dialogues des morts*, and especially in his *Digression sur les anciens et les modernes*, with many concessions but by application of the reasoning already hinted at, drew the conclusion that the Moderns are superior to the Ancients because they have had the same advantages and others as well.

But Charles Perrault carried the matter before a wider audience than the Academy in his *Parallèles des anciens et des modernes*, the publication of which extended over some time. In a series of dialogues discussing the different forms of artistic expression, such as architecture, sculpture, painting, eloquence or poetry, even sciences like medicine, Perrault maintained the freedom of the individual reason and rejected the principle of dogmatic authority. Perrault's views won favor by the plausibility and ingenuity of his theories and the fluency with which he expounded attractive but often superficial ideas.

Boileau's reply to Perrault came in the *Réflexions sur Longin*, an indirect rejoinder, as though Perrault did not deserve a face-to-face encounter. Some time after the two rivals became

reconciled, but the questions they had discussed were not laid aside by the learned world. The writings of Houdar de la Motte and the letter of Fénelon on the occupations of the Academy brought out varying phases of the dispute. During the eighteenth century, as will be seen, the spirit of antiquity was gradually driven into the background by a modern cosmopolitanism and by scientific rationalism in literature, the full development of the Cartesian spirit. Where the doctrine of the Ancients continued to prevail, in the traditional æsthetic manifestations, such as certain forms of the drama, it degenerated into a devitalised and mechanical pseudo-Classicism. Certain critics still enunciated the laws of the school with eloquence and dignity, but its force was completely gone by the time the Romanticists rose against it.

CHAPTER XIV

PULPIT ORATORY. BOSSUET. BOURDALOUE

THE oratory of the seventeenth century before the time of Bossuet and of Bourdaloue was sadly in need of improvement, both among the lay and the religious speakers. The pedantry of the sixteenth-century Humanists had lingered on in the erudition of the Sorbonne and of the courts of law, so that prelates and barristers delivered themselves of extraordinary combinations of Scholasticism and learning, sometimes combined with elements of triviality which resulted in wonderful anti-climaxes. Even the best lawyers, such as Lemaître, later one of the leaders of Port-Royal, could not divest their style from the flowers of poetry and of mythology in pleading the commonest cases. The address of l'Intimé in Racine's *Plaideurs*, with its description of chaos preceding the creation of the world, is not too overdrawn a satire of a confused *genre* into which Classic restraint had not penetrated.

The state of pulpit oratory was as bad. The question here was not of gaining a suit by erudition, but often rather of winning worldly favor and social esteem through flowery speeches. The mellifluous phrases of Saint François de Sales became in the mouths of inferior preachers unutterably bad. Not that all tendencies were hopeless: the Oratorians kept up a nobler strain of language, as the Benedictines clung to the sincerity of cloistered erudition. But the rhetoric of the Jesuits tended towards floridness, the elaboration of metaphorical exegesis and indulgence in plays upon thought or *pointes*, — "le docteur en chaire en sema l'évangile," as Boileau said. Castillon saw a proof of the love of Mary in that *Marie* is the anagram of *aimer*.

Preachers like Bossuet and Bourdaloue were destined to give real dignity and simplicity to public oratory.

Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet, the "eagle of Meaux," is deemed to mark the culmination of Classical prose rhetoric; and, indeed, his grandiloquence, his solemnity of expression reminding one somewhat of a religious Daniel Webster, are the best specimen of the "literature of Versailles," and of what Matthew Arnold called the "Grand Style": — "when a noble nature, poetically gifted, treats with simplicity or with severity a serious subject."[1]

He was a native of Dijon in Burgundy, born in 1627 from the *bourgeoisie*, or, to be more precise, a *famille de robe*. He was from the earliest childhood destined for the Church, was tonsured at eight, became a canon at thirteen. After brilliant classical studies under the direction of the Jesuits he was made a doctor of divinity, archdeacon and dean of Saarbrück and Metz, though he had, it is said, his brief fling in the borderland between society and religion, in the fashionable sets of Paris. At Metz he remained for half a dozen years, preaching and trying to convert Protestants and Jews. His sphere of influence next spread to Paris, where his fame grew as a religious orator, giving noted sermons and preaching a funeral oration, no longer in existence, upon Anne of Austria.

In 1669 he was made bishop of the remote and tiny town of Condom in the south of France, but soon resigned the post on

[1] There is a striking passage on Bossuet by Joubert, to which Matthew Arnold alludes in his essay on Joubert: "Bossuet emploie tous nos idiomes, comme Homère employait tous les dialectes. Le langage des rois, des politiques et des guerriers; celui du peuple et du savant, du village et de l'école, du sanctuaire et du barreau; le vieux et le nouveau, le trivial et le pompeux, le sourd et le sonore: tout lui sert; et de tout cela il fait un style simple, grave, majestueux. Ses idées sont, comme ses mots, variées, communes et sublimes.

"Tous les temps et toutes les doctrines lui étaient sans cesse présents, comme toutes les choses et tous les mots. C'était moins un homme qu'une nature humaine, avec la tempérance d'un saint, la justice d'un évêque, la prudence d'un docteur et la force d'un grand esprit."

being appointed tutor to the dauphin. This was the time of his first great funeral orations still in existence, those on the two Henriettas of France and of England, mother and daughter. Bossuet was more successful as a panegyrist than as a professor, for he had views, and the dauphin was too sluggish to understand theories and too lazy to put them into action. Instead of making the pathway to learning alluring and easy, Bossuet undertook to develop an intellect which did not exist and tortured the brain, while Montausier and the other tutors chastised the body of the royal pupil. As a result, the dauphin, once his education was completed, set to work to forget what he had studied. Very different was the effect of Fénelon's instruction on the dauphin's son, the duc de Bourgogne. French literature has, however, benefited where the dauphin did not, by several works written for him: the *Traité de la connaissance de Dieu et de soi-même*, together with a logic and a treatise on the freedom of the will, the *Politique tirée de l'Ecriture sainte* and, most important of all, the *Discours sur l'histoire universelle.*

Bossuet's literary fame was consecrated by his election to the Academy, and his religious greatness by his appointment to the chaplaincy of the dauphiness and the bishopric of Meaux. If his birth had been more noble and his enemies fewer, he would undoubtedly have received even higher ecclesiastical honors. He gave other great funeral orations after the death of Queen Marie-Thérèse, of the Princess Palatine, of the chancellor Michel Le Tellier and of Condé, and preached at the pathetic withdrawal of Mlle de la Vallière into the convent. Meanwhile he had become the leader of the French Church and directed the bishops of the Gallican movement when the clergy of France set forth their declaration in an important dispute between the king and the pope. The quarrel was one of the many phases of the rivalry between the head of the Church and the head of the nation, such as had gone on at intervals ever since the Middle Ages. Its efficient cause upon this occasion was a disagreement over the destination of the revenues of vacant ecclesiastical

holdings, the *droits de régale*, and the Gallican party argued that the king should be independent in his realm with only an infallible church, not an infallible pope over him.

In his last years Bossuet's chief works were an *Histoire des variations des églises protestantes*, the *Méditations sur l'Evangile*, and the *Elévations sur les mystères*. He died in 1704. He had made himself leader of the clergy of his time by his eloquence and dignity as well as by the influence which his court position had given him. But this did not prevent him from having some resounding discussions, particularly in his old age, and not always to his credit. One of these was with a rationalistic Biblical student, Richard Simon, whose *Histoire critique de l'Ancien Testament* was a remote precursor of modern exegesis and scientific criticism. Another controversy was with the P. Caffaro, a Theatine priest of Italian origin, who had expressed views favorable to the drama. The vehemence of Bossuet's indignation and his *Maximes et réflexions sur la comédie* brought out a recantation from Caffaro. Still another and even more famous dispute was the lengthy quarrel with Fénelon over Mme Guyon and quietism, which resulted in Bossuet's *Relation sur le quiétisme*.

Bossuet gave a new form and value to the funeral oration. The French have always admired preaching, and one need only compare France and England to see how much more numerous religious discourses are in the former country from the days of the Latin sermons of the Middle Ages, the eloquence of Maurice de Sully, the mysticism of Gerson, through the Rabelaisian freedom of hortatory speeches by Menot and Maillard at the beginning of the Renaissance, to the new style of modern times.

But all was not for the best when Bossuet came. For besides the great sermons of the Reformers who clothed Hebraic thought in classic phraseology, and by their austerity seemed almost desirous of frightening away rather than of attracting the vacillating in faith, orthodox Catholics, clinging to Latin tradition and Ciceronian rhetoric, fell more and more into the floridity of

the Jesuitical style and the general ornateness of an age yielding in one country to Marinism, in another to preciosity. In the Cardinal Du Perron and in his opponent Du Plessis-Mornay the two styles are opposed.

In the seventeenth century the establishment of the new order of the Oratoire by Bérulle and the rise of Jansenism tended to bring back austerity if not always simplicity, and the charitable Saint Vincent de Paul, preaching to and for his foundlings, made the sermon an expression of tenderness and of naturalness.

But this analysis does not explain Bossuet: he stands apart with an intellect and expression of his own. His sermons were carefully planned, though not as a rule intended for publication by him. And though he allowed himself scope for digression and expatiation, he is the best representative of the dignified, sometimes ponderous, style of French Classicism. It is an improvement upon Balzac's written oratory, but a continuation of the tendencies of that author, whom, indeed, Bossuet considered one of the best fitted to mould style. Bossuet never loses the consciousness of his dignity, and the anecdote is characteristic which tells of his refusing to run with the rest of a company caught in a shower because it was not seemly for a priest to make haste. Bossuet is the exponent of Classical rationalism, and even his love of the Saviour, it has been pointed out, comes from the head and not the heart.

But in his sermons and panegyrics Bossuet sought the support of his wide reading: The Fathers of the Church, Greek as well as Latin, were from the start the marrow of his discourse, sometimes appearing with an almost pedantic ubiquitousness. Gradually, however, he simplified his rhetoric and polished his language, by veiling more satisfactorily his logical plan and toning down the exuberance of his erudition, acquiring thus force with simplicity.

The perfection of Bossuet's oratory is found in his funeral orations, and there his superiority to his predecessors is marked.

For in this style of discourse bad taste had been most rampant. The orator undertook, in presence of a fashionable audience, to deliver an eulogy which was too apt to be a chance for self-display. It was likely to degenerate into stock terms of adulation, to show no true emotion. Bossuet, on the other hand, imbued with true religious feeling and a realisation of the majesty of death and the vanity of the world, approaches his subject with no less dignity and with greater spiritual nobility. His oration remains a ceremonious function delivered in public before a large audience, including the kinsmen of the dead. Yet, in the midst of his eulogy, Bossuet never forgot the great laws of the world, the ways of Providence, the ineluctability of Death.

If we call up before our eyes the vision of Bossuet delivering a funeral oration in sonorous tones and measured phrase before an audience of royalty and aristocracy, in an incense-laden atmosphere, under the stained glass and pealing organ, amid the rich ecclesiastical vestments of the Catholic ritual, we can realise what a place this form of oration occupied in an aristocratic literature, and understand how the periods of an orator proclaiming the majesty of God may be as typical of the theatrical *grand siècle* as the tragedies of Racine.

The subjects of Bossuet's funeral orations belonged to the royal and noble old-world order which his phrases could so well commemorate with an almost rhythmic beat of drumlike Latin quotations from the Vulgate. Their careers, too, suggested how God raises and brings man low, and makes even the mightiest by trial and sorrow become a lesson to others. There was Henriette de France, daughter of Henry IV, who went to England as the queen of Charles I, only to see her husband murdered by an angry people and to be herself an exile in her native land. But her misfortunes were a good fortune, since they showed how her great heart rose above her sufferings. There was Henriette d'Angleterre, her daughter, who had been present at the previous discourse and who within a year followed her mother to the grave at the age of twenty-six, by a sudden and

mysterious death. This death cast terror on all who heard of it, and Bossuet felt it as a personal loss: "O nuit désastreuse! ô nuit effroyable, où retentit tout à coup, comme un éclat de tonnerre, cette étonnante nouvelle: MADAME se meurt, MADAME est morte!" Thirteen years later came the commemoration of a lonely and neglected queen, Marie-Thérèse, who had lived a pathetic existence, seeing her children die one after another, her husband abandon her for his mistresses, and had at last been sacrificed to inefficient medical treatment. There was next a high moral lesson to be drawn from the career of Anne de Gonzague, the Princess Palatine, who after a wild career full of compromising adventures and affiliation with the *libertins*, had felt the power of Grace, and had devoted herself to a life of good deeds. There was Michel Le Tellier, neither a prince nor a great man but chancellor of France. Finally, in 1687, came the greatest and last of the orations, in honor of Condé, the brilliant general who had stirred up in France turmoil and rebellion, but who was to Bossuet an example, in his death, of piety and devotion to God and to king.

The sermons of Bossuet appeal today chiefly to the faithful and to students of rhetoric; the funeral orations, because of their historical importance and the pride and circumstance of their delivery, can appeal to all. But the rest of Bossuet's voluminous writings have been borne along by the success of his greatest works. Bossuet was an orator more than a writer. Conventional admiration has consecrated the *Discours sur l'histoire universelle*, but "Great Heavens," cried Renan, "what a book, written as it was by an old-fashioned theologian, with which to teach to modern liberal youth the philosophy of history!" It was intended to train the mind of the dauphin to government, by pointing out the lessons which history teaches, showing the blessings of Christianity. For all is carried back to Providence, which is the underlying principle of Bossuet's philosophy, as Evolution is of modern science. The work is an attempt to generalise or "philosophise" history with the postulates of

religion as a foundation, and to explain the history of all mankind as an interpretation of the laws of God. History does not prove religion, but religion explains history. The survey of mankind is incomplete as it stands, but it has, at any rate, the merit of lofty generalisation and the sweep of an eagle glance over the past of humanity. In the earliest editions it was not even divided into chapters, and carried one along by the majesty of its *ordonnance*. In the three parts Bossuet develops the epochs from Adam to Charlemagne; the course of religion through the ages; the succession and revolution of "empires." The survey is incomplete by its omission of the Oriental peoples, concerning whom Bossuet of course knew less than nothing; it has sins of commission by too liberal an interpretation of the legends and myths of old historians like Herodotus and Livy.

The *Discours sur l'histoire universelle* is largely dogmatic. The *Politique tirée de l'histoire sainte* and the *Histoire des variations des églises protestantes* are, on the whole, more controversial. In the former Bossuet argues the glory and divinity of that royal power for which Louis XIV stood in France. In the latter he upholds the unity and simplicity of the Catholic religion against the inconsistencies of the various heretical creeds, partly by a series of portraits of the leaders of Protestantism: Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Œcolampadius, Melanchthon, Cranmer, and others.

Bossuet was an intense partisan of the established order; and in a civilisation permeated with the apotheosis of royalty he was not without the fawning attitude which the unquestioning acceptance of an existing *régime* is likely to carry with it. It would be incorrect to see in him merely a cringing courtier of Louis XIV, but he was convinced that heredity and absolutism, as most remote from anarchism, constituted the best order of government for France. Monarchy, as he conceived it, is the necessary bestowal by Providence of sovereignty with authority. The king must be irresponsible to man as the representative of divine Providence; his authority results from long tradition and

is opposed to any violent mutation, such as the novelty of a republic or the bestowal of power to the people would involve. Bossuet's political theories were not drawn from Holy Writ alone, but were based also on Aristotle and on Hobbes, from whose portrayal of the primitive warfare of man against man Bossuet sought a remedy precisely in the undeviating continuity of a monarchy guided by the infallible dispensations of a wise Providence.

It was this attitude which led Bossuet to become the leader of Gallicanism and to support the royal power of his country even against the chief bishop of the Church. The French monarchy was in the temporal world what the Catholic religion was in the spiritual world, but the former was as divinely ordained and was not to be unnecessarily humbled before the other. The monarchy stood for authority against the incoherences of revolution, the Catholic religion for the same unifying principle against the multitudes of heresies.

Bossuet was a pugnacious Burgundian. Opposition to conservative tradition was to him anathema, and the counter-dogmas of the Calvinists, the casuistry of the Jesuits, the quietism of Mme Guyon were by him treated with the same contempt. There could not be a more violent contrast to Bossuet than the sinuous and slippery intellect of Fénelon. Bossuet's greatness lies in the majesty of his style and the vigor of his intellect, devoted to the support of a stationary rather than a progressive intellectual order.

Bossuet was not the only famous preacher of his day. The great Jesuit father Louis Bourdaloue was even more than Bossuet a single-minded shepherd of souls. Born at Bourges in 1632, his whole life was given to the Church and to study. At fifteen he ran away from home, not to seek adventure, but to enter the Jesuit order as a novice. From that time he won great favor as a teacher, in the Jesuit schools, of grammar, rhetoric and philosophy, particularly of morals. Turning gradually by accident more than by design to preaching, from about 1669

and 1670 in Paris he built up such a reputation that for great festivals and "stations" of the church, Lent, Passion, or Advent, he was engaged by the parish wardens for years ahead. His fame promised to outdo that of Bossuet. He was employed, too, on religious missions in various parts of France, particularly among the Huguenot heretics of Montpellier, and for forty years he was a busy confessor and eloquent preacher, to the disgust of the Jansenists, who prided themselves on the monopoly of virtue and were angry at seeing a Jesuit rival as righteous as themselves and far more influential. Bourdaloue's life is summed up in the words of one of his biographers, the austere Protestant Vinet: "Il prêcha, il confessa, il consola, il mourut." He died in 1704.

The interests of Bourdaloue differed essentially from those of Bossuet. The "eagle of Meaux" was taken up with the great designs of Providence, the history of humanity. Bourdaloue, on the contrary, was a moralist, and his sermons deal mainly with the corruption of manners in his day and with the remedy, a return to righteousness and purity of belief. With the directness of a Menot or a Maillard, but without their coarseness of language, Bourdaloue placed before the society of his day the mirror of its vices. Nor were such lessons unnecessary or inopportune. It is in a book like Anatole Feugère's study of Bourdaloue and his times that one realises what a whited sepulchre was the stately society of the later seventeenth century under the nominal splendor of Classical dignity, and even under the sway of Mme de Maintenon, when vice was curbed through hypocrisy but not reformed. Even in Bourdaloue's own time his characterisations of the wicked seemed like vivid prose satires, and Boileau speaks of the *portraits* of Bourdaloue, which could be examples to some of the *Caractères* of La Bruyère, though less abstract. In sermons such as those on hypocrisy and impurity he pulled aside the veil which masked the insincerity of the time, and we understand the fawning court of adulators at Versailles, where all the nobles wanted to be

operated on for the fistula like the king, where the women insisted on having seven months' babies like the dauphiness, where gambling ran riot and fortunes were lost in an hour at *bassette*, while the peasant was ground to the earth under oppressive taxation. In others Bourdaloue inveighed against the intellectual libertinage or unbelief and the looseness of sexual relations, the downfall of family affection which banished daughters to the convent and younger sons to the army. Not less appalling as a symptom of the times were the mysterious murders and poisonings, with which the names of famous criminals like the marquise de Brinvilliers or the *femme* Voisin were connected, which implicated even the highest in the realm, drawing Mme de Montespan into the obscene rites of Satanism and the black mass, and throwing, rightly or wrongly, the germ of suspicion into the mysterious death of Henriette d'Angleterre. That is why Anatole Feugère said that the sermon *De l'impureté* and the *Don Juan* of Molière cast a baleful light over this part of the century. And when one remembers the drunken riots in high life which before long were to show the regent and the duchesse de Berri brought home both of them dead drunk, one appreciates the phrase, "C'est au milieu de ces orgies que s'achèvera le siècle des conversations délicates et de la galanterie décente, le siècle de la marquise de Rambouillet et de madame de la Fayette."

Next to Bossuet and Bourdaloue the great preachers of the time were Mascaron, Fléchier and Massillon.

Jules Mascaron (1634–1703), an Oratorian and bishop of Tulle and Agen, was in his day considered the equal of Bourdaloue. He gave funeral orations for Anne of Austria, Henriette d'Angleterre and Turenne. He shows more clearly than most of his contemporaries the change in the style of oratory. Dignified in bearing, soft and smooth in tone, he was the popular preacher of his day and catered to its tastes by yielding to preciosity and affectation. Gradually he became more serious, yet even to the end his orations were occasionally marred by plays of word or thought.

Esprit Fléchier (1632–1710), bishop of Nîmes, was also famous for his funeral orations, among which were those of Le Tellier and Turenne. They were carefully elaborated, and sometimes over-subtle.

Jean-Baptiste Massillon (1663–1742), an Oratorian like Mascaron, and the most modern of the group, is the one whose works have of the three best survived. He gave funeral orations, among them one in memory of Louis XIV, but especially the series of sermons forming the Grand Carême and the Petit Carême. The smoothness of his style caused him to be dubbed the "Racine of the pulpit."

CHAPTER XV

FÉNELON

FÉNELON was by birth a southerner, of more distinguished ancestry than Bossuet. François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénelon (1651–1715) entered the Church and at an early age became the superior of the *Nouvelles catholiques*, a congregation of recent women-converts from Protestantism. His character was, indeed, in every way suited to make him the spiritual adviser of women. He could be conciliatory and insinuating in manner, yet he had a will tenacious and persistent to the verge of harshness. He remained for ten years in his position and was entrusted also with important missionary work among the Protestants of the southwest, in Aunis and Saintonge. From 1689 to 1695 he was tutor of the duc de Bourgogne, son of the dauphin whom Bossuet had so unsuccessfully tried to train.

Fénelon's problem was as difficult, though different and requiring a different method. Instead of being, like his father, dull and lymphatic, the young duke was haughty and quick-tempered. Bossuet had given his pupil intellectual nausea; Fénelon undertook to soften a high-strung yet sensitive youth by gentleness combined with firmness. He made himself so thoroughly master of his pupil's will that the latter finally took scarcely a step without Fénelon's advice, and the curious phenomenon was observed of a general, a leader of men, consulting a priest as to his actions. It was for the education of his pupil that Fénelon wrote his chief literary works, the fables, the dialogues of the dead, and *Télémaque*. Fénelon's sermons are a less important part of his work than those of Bossuet or of Bourdaloue. Fénelon was intensely ambitious, and in the duke, who was looked on as

the coming king of France, as well as in the powerful Mme de Maintenon he had good friends. But he came into opposition with Bossuet, and in the struggle between craft and strength, victory was on the side of force. The cause of Fénelon's downfall was the part he played in the quarrel over quietism and his support of Mme Guyon.

The seventeenth century was a time of religious manifestations on the part of individuals or groups which are today termed pathological. It was the age of hallucinations such as those of Loudun which caused the death of Urbain Grandier; it was the period which produced the visions of Marie Alacoque and her worship of the Sacred Heart. Mme Guyon was the great mystic of modern France.

Born prematurely in 1648, her childhood was marked by continued illness. It is to be supposed that her whole life was influenced thereby, for it was filled with hysterical crises, visions, hallucinations, morbid fears of hell, yearnings for sacrifice, softened at times by the writings of Saint François de Sales into a poetic and ecstatic vision of God. At the age of sixteen she was married to a man of thirty-eight with a temperament out of harmony with hers. She turned more and more toward piety and finally experienced a definite conversion to the mystic love of God and a renunciation of the world. She saw in herself a bride of Jesus, like Saint Catherine or Saint Theresa, and in imagination lived out the impassioned love of the Song of Songs. She showed, meanwhile, symptoms of hysteria, trances, and swellings of the body great enough to burst her clothes.

Such behavior horrified the placid and even-minded. People could not help connecting Mme Guyon's views with the excesses to which the teachings of other mystics had led through thinking that, the mind alone being of value, the body may freely commit every sin if only the soul is immersed in divine contemplation. A recent impetus had been given to mysticism by the teachings of the Spaniard Molinos. Mme Guyon's actions seemed to

justify suspicions of immorality: she neglected her children and travelled with a priest, the Père La Combe, who was her spiritual adviser and apparently had hypnotic power over her. She wrote the *Moyen court* on the efficacy of prayer, the union with God. Later she composed the *Torrents spirituels*.

On Mme Guyon's return to Paris in 1686 she was at first persecuted and the P. La Combe was put into prison. But gradually she acquired influence even with Mme de Maintenon, and her doctrines were on the point of getting a footing at Saint-Cyr. It is easy to conceive what positions Bossuet and Fénelon would take. The former, with his vigorous rationalism and sound common-sense, was horrified by Mme Guyon's hysterical manifestations, her miracles, and torrents of Grace. Fénelon, with greater sympathy for the emotional temperament, sided with her. The result was a resounding squabble, beginning with Bossuet's *Instruction sur les états d'oraison* and Fénelon's *Explication des maximes des saints*. It did credit to neither contestant, but Bossuet seems to have been, if anything, more to blame. It ended by the rout of Fénelon. Bossuet had an agent at Rome, his nephew the abbé Bossuet. He was tricky and underhanded and succeeded in turning the current in favor of Bossuet who had also the royal influence on his side. Fénelon never seems to have been a favorite with Louis XIV, and from now on his influence at court was destroyed. He had meanwhile been appointed archbishop of Cambrai, and the last seventeen years of his life, from 1697 to 1715, were spent in semi-exile. He received the verdict of the Church with humility, whether sincere or feigned, and remained in his diocese, occupied partly with literary labors including the letter to the Academy, partly with new controversies against the Jansenists. He was perhaps desirous of regaining royal favor, but the death of the duc de Bourgogne made his ambitions fruitless.

Fénelon's character was at variance with his style. His imaginative writings have a gentle and almost rhythmic softness, and that amenity which certain critics deem characteristic of

the Greek spirit. In his descriptions of Calypso's isle in *Télémaque* and in similar passages, we note in the account of fragrant shrubs, of singing birds, and plashing streams the spirit which imagines Hellenism to be a life passed amid flowery meadows of cytisus and asphodel in a land of lasting summer where marble temples stand on every height. Fénelon's true character was uncompromising and militant. Yet he could veil his persistency and craft beneath the courtesy of the gentleman, the sympathy of the priest and of the spiritual adviser of women.

Fénelon's most important work relating to women is the *Traité de l'éducation des filles*. His ideal is neither the *précieuse* nor the pedant at whom Molière laughed. He wanted neither an affectation of *bel esprit* nor one of learning. But he felt that the women of his day were not well brought up when confined to elementary studies and accomplishments. His contention is that a girl should be fitted for her mission in life, which is to be a good wife and house-manager. She need not be confined to the study of reading and writing and to embroidery, but these are tasks important in life and characteristic of woman. Her nature must be consulted in all things, but taught to avoid shiftlessness, extravagance, and vanity. Literature, history, Latin, music, painting are suitable feminine accomplishments when tactfully employed, and education should be confined to practical things. All this may seem very primitive to the twentieth century, but Fénelon was ahead of his time in emphasising character, and in our age of unsexed women his ideal maiden, as she appears in the Antiope of *Télémaque*, is not without qualities:

"Antiope est douce, simple et sage; ses mains ne méprisent point le travail; elle sait se taire et agir de suite sans empressement; elle est à toute heure occupée, et ne s'embarrasse jamais, parce qu'elle fait chaque chose à propos; le bon ordre de la maison de son père est sa gloire: elle en est bien plus ornée que de sa beauté. Quoiqu' elle ait soin de tout, et qu'elle soit chargée de corriger, de refuser, d'épargner (choses qui font haïr presque toutes les femmes),

elle s'est rendue aimable à toute la maison: c'est qu'on ne trouve en elle ni passion, ni entêtement, ni légèreté, ni humeur, comme dans les autres femmes. D'un seul regard elle se fait entendre, et on craint de lui déplaire; elle donne des ordres précis; elle n'ordonne que ce qu'on peut exécuter; elle reprend avec bonté, et en reprenant elle encourage.

The "Hellenism" of Fénelon shows itself particularly in the works composed for the duc de Bourgogne: *Télémaque*, the fables, the dialogues of the dead. He was half a poet and belonged to that school of writers of which Lemaire de Belges had been an early instance. He had loved Greek literature from his school-days and was fond of the eurhythmy of Saint François de Sales, or of Racine the student in his youth of *Theagenes and Chariclea*. At the same time Fénelon was not a Classicist according to the technical conception. He was Classical in being more Greek than a follower of the intellectual Alexandrinism, dogmatic in thought, geometrically rectilinear in expression such as it appears in the writers of the seventeenth century and such as it is found, for instance, in Bossuet whose florid pomp differs from the flowery limpidity of Fénelon.

The work in which these qualities are best shown is *Télémaque*, a romance partly in imitation of the *Odyssey*, in which we see, not the return of Ulysses, but the adventures of Telemachus in search of an absent father. Shortly after the departure of Ulysses from Calypso's isle the goddess gave shelter to the shipwrecked Telemachus escorted by Minerva under the name of Mentor. He relates his adventures to Calypso and she feels love for him, but grows jealous of the attachment of the nymph Eucharis for him, and Telemachus, at Mentor's behest, sets forth anew. So the story continues with many an incident: Telemachus goes down to hell and sees the punishment of the wicked, he visits the Elysian Fields and sees the felicity of the righteous. After numerous adventures he returns to Ithaca, and Mentor, resuming the form of Minerva, gives him parting

counsels. The last sentences of the story are an extraordinary example of a perfunctory and hasty close.

Télémaque is a purely mythological and poetical romance with a moral purport. It may have its value in leading one to the study of Homer; it is worthless for the study of ancient customs. It was chiefly useful in so far as Telemachus stood for the duc de Bourgogne and Mentor for Fénelon himself. People even went farther and saw in *Télémaque* a satire of the times, or at any rate a premeditated contrast between the happy lands visited by Telemachus and France itself, humiliated by defeats at the end of the reign of Louis XIV. It may be unjust to seek too close a parallel, but Fénelon, the writer of the famous though anonymous *Lettre à Louis XIV*, in which he spoke his opinion with great boldness, and the author of an *Examen de conscience des devoirs de la royauté* and of the *Tables de Chaulnes*, advice for the duc de Bourgogne, the result of conversations held at Chaulnes, may well have had in mind practical advice for his pupil. Fénelon stood with the party of malcontents whose favorite was the duc de Bourgogne.

The influences upon the composition of *Télémaque* are numerous. The general spirit of the dialogues of Plato and the profuse imagery of neo-Platonism must have been always present to his mind. He got the suggestion of the work from the *Cyropædia* of Xenophon, the romance of Cyrus's youth and education which tells how he learned to obey and to command, and from the *Economics* of the same Greek writer. The modern Latin romance, the *Argenis* of Barclay, has, on perhaps insufficient grounds, also been suggested. Episodes and detail come from all quarters. And like many a predecessor, beginning with Homer and Virgil, Telemachus visits the lower world. But his trip results in moral edification. On the other hand, the picture of the blessed in the Elysian Fields, enjoying sweet serenity, is an interpretation of the ataraxy which many think they see in ancient Hellenism influenced by one who sympathised with the beatitude of Mme Guyon's quietism.

Télémaque was a romance intended for a comparatively mature period in Fénelon's pupil; the fables and the dialogues of the dead had been adapted to his earlier youth. The fables, unlike those of La Fontaine, in prose and with a much more conventionally edifying morality, are often graceful word pictures and idyls. The *Dialogues des morts*, borrowing the form of Lucian's writings, have also a moral end and inculcate lessons in political ethics.

The *Traité de l'existence de Dieu* is the work of a subtle philosopher. The first part deals with the argument of final causes, leading to the conclusion that nature has an intelligent cause; the second portion is partly Cartesian in its methodic doubt directed to the proof of God, partly neo-Platonic in its theories of the unity and oneness of the Godhead.

To the student of the technicalities of literary theory there is much of interest in the *Dialogues sur l'éloquence*, and especially in the *Lettre à l'Académie* which was written shortly before his death. The former of these works consisted of three dialogues apparently in Platonic style, but rather mechanical and so impersonal that the characters have no individuality. Fénelon's purpose is to criticise the preaching in vogue and to oppose it to the true spirit of Holy Writ and of the Fathers of the Church, with which the orator ought to be permeated. Without naming Bourdaloue, Fénelon takes him as an example of bad taste.

Fénelon was himself a member of the French Academy and, though living at Cambrai, he was interested in its efforts to find something to do. In its early days Chapelain had suggested for it a comprehensive scheme ranging from a dictionary to treatises on rhetoric and poetry. Of these the dictionary alone had been carried into effect. At the beginning of the eighteenth century the Academy began to consider anew the possibilities of work. Among the material contributed to the discussion was the letter of Fénelon to the newly appointed secretary Dacier. This document, a development of a previous *mémoire*, renews many of the suggestions of an earlier generation, but the

mental attitude of Fénelon is totally different from the dogmatism of the earlier Classicists. He advocates the speedy completion of the second edition of the dictionary for the benefit of strangers and for those who may wish to study the present condition of the language in future generations. An official grammar would give a standard to those who come from different provinces; an effort might well be made to give greater wealth to the language by new words and new verbal constructions: Fénelon misses the richness of sixteenth-century French and seems to hint at some of the experiments already attempted by Ronsard in adding words and expressions. He suggests, as had been done nearly a century before, a rhetoric and a work on poetics, but he goes farther in advising treatises on tragedy, comedy, and history. His observations on poetry and on tragedy are, on the whole, unfavorable to the writers of the modern age. He criticises the poetry of the seventeenth century as being monotonous in expression and subtle in thought. Tragedy he condemns for adding to the simplicity of the Greek plots the element of sentimental love, and he blames Corneille's *Œdipe* and Racine's *Phèdre* for yielding to the *bel esprit* of the age. In comedy Fénelon makes concessions and places Molière, in spite of his faults, high among poets. In the section on history Fénelon is ahead of his time in his desire to see impartiality, vividness, simplicity, the reproduction of historical coloring, and the study of institutions.

In the concluding pages of his letter Fénelon touches upon matters at issue between the partisans of the Ancients and the Moderns in a way that hardly gives satisfaction to the resolute defenders of either side. Fénelon favored the Ancients, but his procedure was by concessions to achieve ulterior gains, and he conceded so much that it takes a knowledge of his whole position to realise where he really belonged. He begins by wishing that the Moderns could surpass the Ancients: even the best among these had their flaws. On the other hand, sequence of time does not make superiority. Gothic architecture, though later than

Greek art, is not better: Lucan does not replace Virgil, Seneca Sophocles, or Tasso Virgil and Homer. Therefore the men of today should not be too scornful of those who have gone before.

In the *Lettre à l'Académie* Fénelon is at the same time a partisan of that antiquity so dear to him and, in works like *Télémaque*, so obviously incorporated into his thought. Yet the appreciation of antiquity is to him a matter of feeling and of personal interpretation rather than the system dogmatically imposed by the critics belonging to the Classical school. So Jules Lemaître sympathetically greets in him an impressionist.

CHAPTER XVI

THE WOMEN OF THE GRAND SIÈCLE

SOCIETY shows a change in its ideals from the first to the second half of the seventeenth century, particularly in those manifestations where the influence of women is seen. The sentimental romantic vein is as persistent as ever it was in the early vogue of *Astrée*, when the diversion of society was to discuss the art of *galanterie*. During the vogue of Mlle de Scudéry's novels and of the romanesque drama of the type of Thomas Corneille, the sombre, melancholy hero was the fashion. He had to have an *air languissant*, or as the young woman in the *Précieuses ridicules* expressed it, "sortir de là tout rêveur et mélancolique." Meanwhile the emotional phases of the Jansenist influence had introduced more "sensibility" or feeling. The sturdy, masculine woman shown in literature by the stoical heroine of Corneille and in life by the intriguing ladies of the Fronde yielded to the *névrosées* of Racine. The amazons of the earlier generation turned to nursing *vapeurs* and to devotion, the emotional spasms of which Segrais called the "petite vérole de l'esprit." The Grande Mademoiselle tried to combine virility and the "great passion" and, after putting into practice the *galanterie* of Corneille's early comedies, perhaps reacted on the heroines of his later plays, like *Pulchérie*. But women like Mme de Chevreuse, masquerading as a man and the embodiment of conspiracy, are more rare, and Mme de Longueville, one of the moving spirits of the Fronde, becomes the protectress of Port-Royal. The vigorous woman gave way to the pale and anæmic lady of the *salons*, and the counterpart appeared in the works of fiction.

In 1669 the publication of the *Love Letters of a Portuguese Nun* flooded literature with a new stream of sentiment, though it was a truer and more sincere passion than the sublimated nonsense of the *roman galant*, and thereby exerted a salutary return to truthful analysis. The author of the *Princesse de Clèves* had contemporaries of more or less renown in Mlle Catherine Bernard, a kinswoman of Corneille, in Hortense Desjardins (Mme de Villedieu), in Mlle de la Force, in Mme d'Aulnoy, the writer of sentimental fairy-tales, and in Mme Durand.

The women of the *grand siècle* varied in their interests and the quality of their charm, but their influence was nearly always exerted by social reunions. Each *salon* had its individual stamp according as its mistress was an Aspasia like Marion Delorme and Ninon de Lenclos or a bluestocking, but men passed freely from one to the other. In these *salons* reputations were made and unmade, cabals were set in motion, love intrigues planned, or discussions started concerning morals, religion, and Cartesian philosophy. Vaugelas said that women were to be consulted in matters of language as well.

It would be a long task to give a list of the social centres of the seventeenth century. They were, indeed, not all under the influence of women, for the formal and informal academies of men were important groups as well. We have seen, however, how the Hôtel de Rambouillet threw into the shade its contemporaries in feminine influence. But it soon had a vigorous rival in the Saturdays of Sappho, where preciosity and the lighter form of pedantry held sway, where madrigals were strung out, and where the amiable ecclesiastics of this "pépinière d'évêques" paid court to Sappho. There were *précieux* gatherings of Mme de Fiesque, Mme de Choisy, Mme de Saint-Martin, and Mme de Maure. On the other hand, the reprobates of irreligion were to be found at Scarron's house paying their respects to Mme Scarron, later to be Mme de Maintenon. At the Hôtel de Longueville she who had been called the most beautiful woman of her day exerted

an influence political rather than literary; at the Hôtel de Luxembourg the Grande Mademoiselle, author of extraordinary memoirs, when not seeking a husband, was the patroness of Segrais and Huet. Mme de la Sablière, the friend of La Fontaine, had one of the most frequented *salons* of Paris. The love of this lady and of the marquis de la Fare was called a beautiful example of fidelity outside of marriage, until he abandoned her and drove her to religion. At the Hôtel de Bouillon the duchesse de Bouillon, a niece of Mazarin, with the help of her brother the duc de Nevers and of Mme Deshoulières, tried to ruin Racine by the *cabale de Phèdre* and Pradon's tragedy. Even across the Channel in distant London another niece of Mazarin, the duchesse de Mazarin, grouped about her a handful of Frenchmen among whom was Saint-Evremond; and in her home criticism alternated with gambling, and the duchess herself gave the example of squandering thousands at *bassette*.

A complete study of the influence of women in the social life of Paris and of Versailles in the seventeenth century would, indeed, include the queens of the left hand of Louis XIV. Some of Molière's comedies were for the entertainment of Mlle de la Vallière; the tempestuous Mme de Montespan, whose sway marks the apogee of Louis's reign, favored an ungrateful Racine; Marie Mancini, a niece of Mazarin, was immortalised in *Bérénice*. One, even, Mme de Maintenon, who became the king's lawful wife, made a name for herself in literature.

One of the most famous of the *salons* and significant for its literary influence was that of Mme de Sablé (1599–1678). She had belonged to the Rambouillet set and from about 1646 had had a *salon* of her own near the Place Royale. About 1659, under the influence of Arnauld d'Andilly, she turned to Jansenism and established herself near Port-Royal in a seclusion which was far from conventual: she was visited by all the distinguished people of the day, men like the prince de Conti, the chevalier de Méré, Pascal, La Rochefoucauld, the abbé Esprit, women like Mme de Longueville. She was fond of letter-

writing and continued the *genre* which Balzac and Voiture had popularised and which Mme de Sévigné made famous. She composed maxims, and those of La Rochefoucauld were written under her influence and submitted to the general criticism of her friends. Victor Cousin went so far as to think that some of Pascal's *Pensées* were written for her or under her influence, as religious maxims. At any rate, the maxims issuing from Mme de Sablé's circle form a connecting link between the "portraits" so much in vogue in the seventeenth century and the generalised portraits or characters for which La Bruyère is famous. The maxims are syntheses of portraits and epitomes of character. Indeed, just as epistles had been the preoccupation of the Hôtel de Rambouillet, madrigals that of Sappho's set, and portraits that of the Luxembourg, so under the influence of Mme de Sablé the thought and the maxim were elaborated. Two other women, Mme de Sévigné and Mme de la Fayette, transformed two *genres*, the epistle and the novel respectively.

Marie de Rabutin-Chantal, a granddaughter of the blessed Mme de Chantal, friend of Saint François de Sales, was born in 1626 and was educated under the influence of Chapelain and of the sparkling and susceptible scholar Ménage, who languished for her as he did for his other clever pupil, Mme de la Fayette. In 1644 she married the marquis de Sévigné who was killed in a duel in 1651, leaving two children, Françoise and Charles. The daughter became the wife of a battered widower, the comte de Grignan, lieutenant-general of Languedoc and of Provence. She followed him to his posts and for many years kept up a correspondence with her mother. The daughter's letters have disappeared, but those of Mme de Sévigné to Mme de Grignan and to her friends have made her famous. She died in 1696.

The predecessors of Mme de Sévigné in the seventeenth century had considered letter-writing a solemn composition prepared with one eye cocked at posterity, or else as a *jeu d'esprit*. Voiture had made letters a form of wit, but in the

romances of Mlle de Scudéry they had been raised to an individual type. Everybody in those days wrote letters and the correspondence of Malherbe, Descartes, Guy Patin among others has been preserved. Pascal's *Lettres provinciales* show what they become as a vehicle for literary expression; Mme de Maintenon illustrates how the "schoolma'am" wrote. No collection has the importance or the interest of that of Mme de Sévigné.

She was a woman of natural cleverness and of acquired training, serious in her views of life as her early reading implies and as her sympathy for the writers of Port-Royal tends to show. Without being a Jansenist she was their friend and thought that "jamais personne n'a écrit et n'a anatomisé le cœur humain comme ces messieurs-là." She had sententious tendencies, and her intimacy with La Rochefoucauld turned her toward aphorisms in the midst of her letters.

But the present value of Mme de Sévigné's letters is in the picture they give us of life in the seventeenth century. Like La Rochefoucauld and Saint-Evremond she had seen the change from the first to the second half, when the irreconcilable and half independent nobles became fawning hypocrites chafing under Mme de Maintenon. It was this world, with its gossip and scandals, its jealousies and petty ambitions, that she described in her letters. But in spite of her frequent moralising, she does not set herself up as a moralist. She merely gossips to her daughter or her friends at headlong speed; hence her familiar and sometimes careless expression. Nevertheless, there is in her letters a striving after literary effect, whether conscious or unconscious. This is at times exasperating, as in the letter on Lauzun and the Grande Mademoiselle, where she delays so long by all kinds of devices the actual statement of her "extraordinary" news that the reader gets impatient. But nothing could excel the vividness of the famous and even hackneyed letters describing the practical joke played by the king on his courtier whom he led to condemn a poem by the royal pen, or

the account of the suicide of the steward Vatel who felt disgraced at the prospect of seeing his dinner go wrong. The account of the execution of Mme de Brinvilliers is as striking as the scene itself must have been.

Mme de Sévigné had a sense of humor; she liked to gossip and tell anecdotes. Above all, she had a sympathetic character: she was fond of her friends and they were fond of her. The adjective "bon" is with her almost overdone, and her fidelity to the fallen Fouquet or to her scapegrace cousin, the undeserving Bussy-Rabutin, is much to her credit. Hence the friendly touch of her writings, relieving them from the stiltedness which marks so many of the writers of the *grand siècle*. Only in her occasional callousness to the sufferings of others, such as the peasants or the condemned marquise de Brinvilliers, does the unconcern of the seventeenth-century women of rank crop out. The terms of endearment lavished on Mme de Grignan often seem excessive to the Anglo-Saxon mind, but the contentment which Mme de Sévigné manifests at life in the country, usually a place of gloomy exile to her contemporaries and especially to her cousin Bussy, shows a simplicity of disposition with which few of the intriguing women of her day can be credited.

Mme de Sévigné is, indeed, in marked contrast with her daughter, whose reserved character combined with a fondness for abstract thought and Cartesian philosophy, has caused her to be held up to undeserved ridicule as a woman without feeling and of the kind whom Molière satirises in the *Femmes savantes*.

Marie de la Vergne, or as she is known in literature, Mme de la Fayette (1634–1693), was worshipped by the susceptible Ménage in Latin *vers de société* under the name of Laverna. Of her husband hardly anything is known and she had practically nothing to do with him. On the other hand, her name was for years bound up with that of La Rochefoucauld, whose cynical old age she cheered and softened. She was a favorite at court, the companion of Henriette d'Angleterre, the friend of scholars

and men of letters like Huet, the Humanist and bishop of Avranches, or Segrais, who like La Rochefoucauld became in part her collaborator or at least her literary mask.

Mme de la Fayette wrote a couple of personal historical works, the *Vie d'Henriette d'Angleterre* and the *Mémoires de la cour de France pour les années 1668 et 1669*. The former, of which the composition was instigated by its heroine and even drawn up under her personal observation, is a frank revelation of the feelings of the thoughtless but well-loved English princess. The *Mémoires de la cour de France* are not very important.

It is in the history of the French novel that Mme de la Fayette was destined to be famous, though she always refused to acknowledge the authorship of what she had written. In 1662 she had published anonymously an historical novel called *la Princesse de Montpensier*, in which she anticipated her later masterpiece and placed the setting in the same sixteenth century. *Zayde* of 1670, drawn from the Spanish and published under Segrais's name, for it was not *convenable* for a lady of quality to write under her own name, was composed in the older romantic style from which Mme de la Fayette was herself to release French literature. Finally, in 1678, appeared the *Princesse de Clèves* which Mme de la Fayette wrote, undoubtedly assisted by La Rochefoucauld, but the authorship of which they both denied.

This novel gave a severe blow to the Scudéry romances in ten volumes. It was a brief story showing for the first time the true analysis of a woman's heart. The princesse de Clèves, in spite of her love for the duc de Nemours, remains faithful to her husband. The story represents, like a Cornelian drama of the best type, the conflict of love and duty; like a Racinian play it has truth of analysis. A concise story quickly moving to a climax, it is the highest example in prose fiction of French Classicism. Said Mme de la Fayette herself: "Une période retranchée d'un ouvrage vaut un louis d'or et un mot vingt sols."

Mme de Maintenon (1635–1719) was the granddaughter of

the Huguenot poet Agrippa d'Aubigné, the daughter of his worthless son, and was born while her father was in prison at Niort. Later the widow of Scarron, whom she married for protection, she became the governess of the children of the king and Mme de Montespan. After the latter's fall from favor and the death of the queen she was, at the age of nearly fifty, married to the king and for almost thirty years more kept him somewhat under her influence.

Mme de Maintenon was less brilliant than Mme de Montespan, and her remarkable rise was partly due to the reaction in the king's taste from the tempests of the one to the calm of the other. Her convictions were not very firm: she leaned in turn toward Jansenism and quietism; she did not protest at the revocation of the Edict of Nantes and the persecution of her former coreligionaries. She was, indeed, even untrue to them. What did particularly characterise her was her solemnity. She, who as Françoise d'Aubigné had been called "Bignette" and witnessed as a spectator the wild life of Scarron's friends, became to Louis XIV *la Raison* and *Votre Solidité*. Her vocation was really that of a school-teacher, and her predilection for instruction had dried away sentiment in her nature and turned her into a hard and gloomy woman who seemed to care more for esteem than love.

Mme de Maintenon wrote letters and various pedagogical *Entretiens*, *Proverbes*, and *Conversations*. These works were composed for the benefit of the school of Saint-Cyr which she directed. This was an establishment for the education of impecunious girls of noble rank. They were withdrawn for years from their families and returned only when their education, obviously a matter chiefly of charity, was complete. The original plan was for a secular school, a novel idea at a time when the education of young women was entirely entrusted to convents. Later Mme de Maintenon yielded to criticism, and in 1692 the maison de Saint-Louis, as it was called, was transformed into a convent of Augustinian sisters. For a long time Mme de

Maintenon's interests were wrapped up in Saint-Cyr, and she found in it a field of experiment for her theories of education and even of the physical régime of girls.

The *Memoirs* of Mme de Motteville (1621–1689), though not published until the eighteenth century, have the same personal value as the letters of Mme de Sévigné. The literary tradition was even more strongly marked in her family, as she was niece of the poet Bertaut, and her value for the period she treats in most detail, the times of Anne of Austria and the Fronde, is greater than that of the better known cardinal de Retz writing entirely with personal bias.

The *femmes savantes* pride themselves on including in their sex the scholar Mme Dacier (1654–1720), the most learned woman of her times, daughter and wife of illustrious savants, editor of many editions of the classics, ardent defender of the Ancients in the great quarrel.

Mme Deshoulières (1637 or 8–1694) was one of the later *précieuses*, when preciosity was rather literary affectation than the cult of individual words and was passing into pedantry, and according to Boileau,

> . . . une précieuse,
> Reste de ces esprits jadis si renommés,
> Que d'un coup de son art Molière a diffamés.

She exerted considerable influence in literary coteries and was one of the leaders in the *cabale de Phèdre*, but her fame is chiefly due to her numerous pastoral idyls and odes as well as her more ambitious dramatic attempts such as the tragedy of *Genséric*. Mme Deshoulières's poetry deserves the epithet of "woolly" both for form and content. It is full of soft moralising, replete with billings and cooings about spring, flowers, or the bleating of her "chères brebis" ("Hélas! petits moutons, que vous êtes heureux"), and tender thoughts of love, carrying one back to *Astrée* and the banks of the Lignon. Her adjectives are "agréable" or "charmant." It is all very pretty, but too cloying to have good taste or value. Yet, at any rate, in a

Cartesian age of brutality to animals she was fond of cats and dogs. Her "philosophy" was one of epicurean disenchantment.

Mme d'Aulnoy (d. 1705) wrote a novel, *Hippolyte, comte de Douglas*, influenced by Mme de la Fayette, and *Memoirs* of the court of Spain, the result of a trip, but she is chiefly known by her fairy-tales which, along with those of Perrault, have entered into the world literature of childhood.

CHAPTER XVII

MEN OF THE WORLD. SCHOLARS, JOURNALISTS AND MORALISTS

THE intellectual life of the seventeenth century was not confined to circles under the influence of women. There were other academies besides the Académie française, and plenty of informal gatherings of men. The *cabaret*, like the English coffee-house or the later French *café*, was the resort of congenial spirits, and the libertines of the earlier generations gave vogue to such taverns as the *Pomme de pin*, the *Pressoir d'or*, the *Croix de Lorraine* or the *Fosse aux lions*. Little bands of friendly men of letters met, as Boileau's chums did at his home in the rue du Vieux-Colombier, or at the *Mouton blanc*, to gossip over meals as at the dinners *chez Magny* in the nineteenth century. Or, again, the Académie française had minor sisters in less regularly constituted companies. The abbé d'Aubignac at the Hôtel de Matignon, the scholar Ménage, the Protestant Henri Justel, the abbé Bourdelot were a few of those who aspired to be the guides of taste or the mentors of less distinguished admirers. The modern hackneyed phrase "cher maître" had its seventeenth-century equivalents, and later admirers gathered "Ana," collections of witty and erudite remarks by the deity, such as the *Ménagiana*. In all this the nature of French literature in the seventeenth century is the more clearly brought out to be the result of conversation as much as of solitude and reflection, the product of social life among the men as much as among the women. Men of letters all hovered about the men of the world.

Even among the clergy and scholars a worldly ideal was apt to prevail. Single-minded devotion to study existed, it is true, among the recluses of Port-Royal like Arnauld and Nicole, or

among the erudite Benedictines, whose labors have always been the glory of their order, such as Mabillon. Then there were hard-working librarians like Etienne Baluze, the director of Colbert's collection, or Du Cange, the author of the dictionary of late Latin, or editors of texts like André Dacier, the husband of Mme Dacier, and Bernard de la Monnoye, the Burgundian, who also dabbled in literature, his most enduring monument being the *chanson de La Palisse*. But other scholars were at the same time men of the world. The type of these was Gilles Ménage (Ægidius Menagius, 1613-1692), one of those whom the seventeenth century called "savants en us," the original perhaps of Vadius in Molière's *Femmes savantes*, the author of observations on the French language, of Latin verses, and the master of miscellaneous erudition ranging from Greek, with a smattering of Hebrew, to Italian and the fads and fancies of academies such as the Della Cruscans. His younger contemporary and correspondent the Norman Daniel Huet (1630–1721) spent many years in secular environments before he became priest, and, in 1680, bishop of Avranches. He was an omnivorous reader, an encyclopedic and inquisitive mind who planned and directed the Delphin Classics, besides making Greek and Latin verse, philosophical and religious treatises and literary essays. He was a sturdy partisan of the Ancients in the quarrel with the Moderns, and even in his own century clung rather to the æsthetic tastes of the early part of the age than to those of full Classicism. This was the period which had also been represented on the borderland of erudition by the translator Perrot d'Ablancourt (1606–1664), whose editions, gentlemanly rather than scholarly in style, won the name of the "belles infidèles."

The clergy furnished its quota of writers who went even further into *bel esprit*. The abbé Charles Cotin (1604–1682) was learned, but was misguided enough to imagine himself a poet and a writer of *vers de société*. He was perhaps unduly held up to ridicule by Molière as Trissotin, just as Boileau pilloried him for

his sermons. The Père Bouhours (1628–1702), though a Jesuit father, was a drawing-room favorite and a smooth and insinuating scholar, a purist in word and manner. This did not save him from disputes with Ménage, but in his *Entretiens d'Ariste et d'Eugène* he tried with grace and unctuousness to promote the cause of the Moderns in the great dispute.

The seventeenth century saw the rise in France of what has become one of the greatest influences in modern society, the newspaper. The founder of journalism was an energetic and resourceful physician of Louis XIII, Théophraste Renaudot (1584–1653), a *protégé* of Richelieu. He started the first pawnshop in France and the *bureaux d'adresse*, information or publicity centres as well as intelligence offices, which, with respect for authority, he justified by Aristotle and Montaigne. In 1631 he issued the first number of the *Gazette*, which was planned to be a weekly record of foreign and national events. It was supplemented by the *Nouvelles ordinaires de divers endroits*. Renaudot had, in spite of violent opposition, a monopoly of this method of publicity, and after some changes of title, the publication became in 1672 the *Gazette de France*, a name which it has kept to this day.

The Fronde was responsible for the publication of thousands of grotesque and vicious political squibs in octosyllabic jingling metre directed chiefly against Mazarin and known as *Mazarinades*. They were anonymous, but Gondi, the future cardinal de Retz, was responsible for some of them. These libellous broadsides were peddled through the streets and kept alive the hostility to Mazarin.

The form of the *Mazarinades* was not without its influence on the rhymed letters of Loret. He was a penny-a-liner who devised a scheme of writing weekly letters in the same burlesque metre recording the doings in Paris. They were addressed to Mlle de Longueville, the duchesse de Nemours, his patroness, to whom he read them, and had at first a circulation of a few copies. Soon, however, they were printed and spread more widely. Loret's

letters cover the period from 1650 to 1665, and he found means to write over four hundred thousand verses. These are in no sense high art: they are often the grinding of a Grub-street hack, each one characterised by some laboriously applied adjective, as *sensible*, *folâtre* or *goguenarde*, and concluding with such a phrase as:

> Ecrit le vingt et cinq de mars,
> Ayant mangé des épinards.

Loret had at first no regular name for his compositions, and various ones were used, but they became known in time as the *Muse historique*. After his death there were several imitators and successors, the chief of whom was Robinet.[1]

Another publication, more in the style of a review, was the *Mercure galant*, founded in 1672 by Donneau de Vizé (1640–1710), the critic, dramatist, and foe of Molière. In an earlier part of the century there had already been a short-lived annual called the *Mercure français*. Donneau de Vizé afterwards took as collaborator Thomas Corneille. The *Mercure* aimed at combining politics, literature and society, and it ranged from news of marriages and deaths to accounts of sermons and of meetings at the Academy. After 1678 it became a monthly, and during the eighteenth century it had a long and honorable career, bearing the names of *Mercure de France* and *Mercure français*, and counting among its contributors Voltaire, Marmontel, Raynal La Harpe and Chamfort.

Still another periodical has, like Renaudot's *Gazette*, survived until today, the *Journal des savants*, founded in 1665 by Denis de Sallo, a counsellor of the Paris courts. At its inception this periodical was not a technical review, but was intended to popularise and disseminate knowledge of recent literary events. It had the distinction of leading the way for numerous imitations at the passage from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century

[1] Compare the modern *Gazette rimée* of the contemporary versifier Raoul Ponchon, published in the periodical press such as *le Journal*.

in France and abroad, particularly at Amsterdam, the clearing-house of French literature, such as Bayle's *Nouvelles de la République des lettres*, the various *Bibliothèques* of Leclerc, and the famous *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des sciences et des beaux-arts* of the Jesuits of Trévoux, known as the *Journal de Trévoux*.

Contemporary history was well provided for by various records, and the numerous memoirs of the seventeenth century, like those of Bassompierre, of Mme de Motteville, the Grande Mademoiselle, Gourville, not to speak of Retz and Saint-Simon, give ample knowledge of the social life of the time. Serious historians, such as Mézeray, the author of a history of France, were rare: the Livy-like periods of De Thou's Latin history had spoiled the taste for history in the vernacular. Louis XIV took as chroniclers two poets, Racine and Boileau. Gossips of the pattern of Tallemant des Réaux or Bussy-Rabutin were, after all, more deserving of the name of men of letters, and were, in spite of their slanders and backstairs gossip, more interesting. Both among men of letters and men of the world the same types recur: a gentlemanly exterior veiling a blackguard's disposition, combined with the cultivation of good letters and its expression in witty memoirs or souvenirs of life among people of quality.

Jean Corbinelli, of Italian origin, who lived over a century from 1615 to 1716, the friend of Retz, La Rochefoucauld, Bussy and Mme de Sévigné, was an example of the epicurean man of letters and drawing-room philosopher; but the "*honnête homme*," the modern gentleman and new καλὸς κἀγαθός was the chevalier de Méré, who influenced La Rochefoucauld, La Bruyère and Mme de Maintenon, and with the somewhat more advanced libertine Miton helped to form the atticism of Pascal. The chevalier de Méré (1610–1684) by his writings and attitudes illustrated the good manners of the day. The "*honnête homme*" tended in morals to some form of hedonism. He was eloquent in conversation and in letter-writing, charming to ladies and their professed though selfish admirer, but guided by his reason rather than his emotions. Hence he would be undisturbed by

hazardous contingencies, free from sordid money worries, one in whom self-culture has become cultivated selfishness. In a word, the *honnête homme*, according to La Rochefoucauld, one of the best instances, is "celui qui ne se pique de rien."

Paul de Gondi (1613–1679), better known as the cardinal de Retz, of Italian origin, was an instance of the political and social intriguer. His policy was, however, not so much flattery of the powers in control as persistent opposition. He early set himself against Richelieu, and then became the rival of Mazarin. His ruling passions were ambition and vanity, to which he subordinated everything. To be in the public eye, "monter sur le théâtre," in his own words, was his aim. He was proud to consider himself a French Catiline: "Je pris, après six jours de réflexion, le parti de faire le mal par dessein, ce qui est sans comparaison le plus criminel devant Dieu, mais ce qui est le plus sage devant le monde." He tried to make his way by the help of women, and though he was unfeeling enough with them, his greatest annoyance was when, including the queen, they failed to be charmed by his ugly, misshapen though sprightly little person. A libertine, both moral and religious, he was truly masquerading under false colors in seeking preferment, and when he sided with the Jansenists, a pamphleteer said that before being a Jansenist he would have to become a Christian. Yet this was the man who tried to supplant Richelieu, and ultimately became bishop-coadjutor, cardinal and archbishop of Paris.

The cardinal de Retz began his literary career early by writing the *Histoire de la conjuration du comte de Fiesque*. The *Memoirs* were not composed until after 1671 towards the end of his life, but by language, style, and subject-matter they belong to the first half of the century, particularly the period of the Fronde. They come down to 1655. He was, in truth, one of the leaders of that civil war, a parody of the Ligue. He levied a regiment dubbed, from his being bishop *in partibus* of Corinth, the "régiment de Corinthe," and met defeat in his first encounter, nicknamed his "First Corinthians." At times he backed Mazarin

in hopes of the red hat, he was ready to murder Condé, was imprisoned, ran away to Italy, participated in the papal conclave and once received eight votes for the papacy. After the death of Mazarin he quieted down somewhat, and, soon retiring somewhat under compulsion from the archbishopric of Paris, he received the abbey of Saint-Denis. During the last years of his life he unexpectedly tried several times to get rid of the cardinalate and devoted himself to the task of paying off his enormous debts, as well as to the composition of his extraordinary memoirs.

There could be no more vivid document than these. Retz was, according to his own story, a foul villain and hypocrite, and the person who appears in the worst light in his pages is probably their author. They are full of lies and misstatements, and are, therefore, untrustworthy for events or the interpretation of motives. But Retz was true to one person, himself, and so the work is a remarkable portrait. His style has the picturesqueness of modern journalism, his language is easy-flowing though slovenly and confused. For that very reason his memoirs represent to the quick the hot-headed, meddling rake whose career he tries to portray.

Roger de Rabutin, comte de Bussy (1618–1693), the kinsman of Mme de Sévigné, was as great a liar as Retz, but in a different way. He was a soldier and courtier who lived the usual profligate life of men of his position, and to please his mistress Mme de Montglat, wrote his *Histoire amoureuse des Gaules*, a collection of scandalous gossip about the men and women of his time. It was secretly copied and published by another jealous woman, Mme de la Baume, with dire consequences to the author. After imprisonment at the Bastille he was exiled for many years to his country estates in Burgundy, where he suffered agonies in being cut off from Paris and the court. The *Histoire amoureuse* is not remarkable literature, but its small talk is interesting to the explorers into the hidden portions of high life.

Even more in the style of journalistic gossip are the *Histori-*

ettes of Gédéon Tallemant des Réaux (1619–1692). This writer belonged to the middle rather than to the upper classes, but being well off he was able to amuse himself by writing gossip about prominent people. Tallemant was not so spiteful as Bussy, but he was just as fond of scandal. He had seen much of society, at the Hôtel de Rambouillet where he had had his *entrées*, and among the more materialistic and plebeian circles of the capitalists and the *bourgeoisie*. His writings, therefore, tell much about the seventeenth century in undress; though with an eye for the picturesque and a nose for scandal, he was as likely to put down hearsay as truth, if he could only violate proprieties.

With La Rochefoucauld (1613-1680) we come again to the *grand seigneur* and to the *honnête homme*. François, prince de Marcillac and later duc de la Rochefoucauld, shows the transformation of the seventeenth-century nobleman from the semi-feudal fighter to the courtier dwelling in town, occupied with social trifles, ignorant of country life and convinced, like Mascarille, that "hors de Paris il n'y a pas de salut pour les honnêtes gens." La Rochefoucauld had fought in the Fronde, he ended his life as a man of fashion, though a valetudinarian.

As prince de Marcillac he spent his youth under arms. He intrigued against Richelieu, fought the Spanish in Flanders, became the partisan of Anne of Austria, intimate with Mme de Chevreuse. After the death of Richelieu and Louis XIII, he gradually turned against Mazarin and, as the lover of Mme de Longueville, helped to direct the conspiracies and fights of the Fronde. He describes all the strange doings of those times in his *Memoirs*, in the style of Tacitus, which he began about this time. Little by little, wearying of Mme de Longueville or finding her no longer useful for his ambitions, he became her enemy.

After the Fronde La Rochefoucauld joined the ranks of the fine wits. Under the influence of Mme de Sablé's circle and such frequenters of it as Jacques Esprit, he began to write his

Maxims, which were circulated anonymously, criticised, and repolished. These are the quintessence of the *esprit de société* of the period: "universal" character-sketches on a small scale, thumbnail aphorisms in lapidary style. The maxims of La Rochefoucauld purport to be the epitome of universal morals, but they are only the views of the cynical and selfish *roué* who has lost all illusions by his experience with the men and the women of the Fronde. Yet he wishes to remain the polished man of the world and *honnête homme*. This idea of self he embodies in his own description or portrait, composed with the pseudo-frankness of that style of literature: "J'ai quelque chose de chagrin et de fier dans la mine. . . . Je suis mélancolique, et je le suis à un point que, depuis trois ou quatre ans, à peine m'a-t-on vu rire trois ou quatre fois. . . . J'ai de l'esprit et je ne fais point difficulté de l'avouer, car à quoi bon façonner là-dessus? . . . J'ai toutes les passions assez douces et assez réglées. . . . L'ambition ne me travaille point."

The moral philosophy of La Rochefoucauld presupposes the natural selfishness and wickedness of man, and therein it harmonised with the ideas of Port-Royal, to the environment of which he belonged. La Rochefoucauld was never a Jansenist, but the Jansenists were not displeased to find a layman expressing their ideas of the corruption of mankind. His first "moral reflection" is enough to give the keynote of the whole work: "Ce que nous prenons pour des vertus n'est souvent qu'un assemblage de diverses actions et de divers intérêts que la fortune ou notre industrie savent arranger, et ce n'est pas toujours par valeur et par chasteté que les hommes sont vaillants et que les femmes sont chastes."

Towards the end of his life La Rochefoucauld became intimate with Mme de la Fayette. Though far younger than he was and herself in delicate health, she coddled his gout and gathered about him a new circle of literary people. He, in return, helped her in her writings and perhaps, under her soft influence, toned down the acrimony of some of his maxims. Yet these remain

the embodiment of clever bitterness. It was Retz who called La Rochefoucauld one who "n'a jamais été guerrier, quoiqu'il fût très soldat, qui n'a jamais été bon courtisan quoiqu'il eût bonne intention de l'être, qui a toujours eu du je ne sais quoi en tout." To the modern critic La Rochefoucauld is the ambitious man soured by disappointment.

Jean de la Bruyère (1645–1696) was an insignificant bachelor-dependent and tutor in the family of the Condés, who for years scarcely looked beyond the bounds of his protector's household and less often still beyond the walls of Paris, yet who posed as the analyst of human character and made his contemporaries believe him the universal moralist. In so far only as he interprets the limited Classicism of the seventeenth century can La Bruyère be considered a writer for all men, yet one single volume has made him immortal among the French. This work belongs, too, to the years of weariness rather than of vigor of the reign of Louis XIV.

La Bruyère was of the *bourgeoisie*. His life, up to the age of forty, is scarcely known at all. He may have been educated by the Oratorians, for he knew Greek as few but the pupils of the Oratorians and the Jansenists did; he certainly was a lawyer and held a post in the financial administration at Caen in Normandy. In 1684 he entered the Condé household, living especially at Chantilly, as private tutor of the young duc de Bourbon, grandson of the great Condé. This boy, at the age of sixteen, was married to Mlle de Nantes, the natural daughter of the king and Mme de Montespan, so that La Bruyère had two pupils instead of one. For the rest of his life he remained a retainer in the Condé family, though before long the actual tutorship of the children ended. La Bruyère made good use of his opportunities, narrow as they were, and this harmless old bachelor, disdainfully treated by the gentlemen of quality who frequented the Hôtel de Condé, was all the time taking notes for his book of character-studies.

In 1688 there appeared anonymously a volume of translations

from the Greek of the *Characters* of Theophrastus, the disciple and successor of Aristotle. It was accompanied by a number of original moral studies, and in various editions, which rapidly followed, these were developed and increased. In reality, this work is partly a development of the portrait-writing already fashionable, combined with the moralised philosophy of "maxims" and "thoughts." In part it is influenced by the vogue which "characters" had had ever since Casaubon's Latin translation of Theophrastus in 1592, and the French translation in 1610 of the *Characterisms of Virtues and Vices* of Bishop Hall, the English imitator of Theophrastus.

The result was literary fame for La Bruyère, and ultimately his election to the Academy, where he took sides with the partisans of the Ancients. Not only in his *discours de réception* but in various pages of his writings, La Bruyère gave utterance to judgments upon authors which justify us in classing him among literary critics of an observing rather than of a constructive nature.

The end of La Bruyère's life, like its beginning, was so uneventful as to cause little record. He was a friend of Bossuet, who had brought about his admission into the Condé family, and sympathy with Bossuet perhaps led La Bruyère to side with him against a fellow-Hellenist Fénelon and to write some dialogues on quietism. But the authenticity of these, which appeared posthumously under his name, has been doubted.

La Bruyère's views of life are those of the wizened but not necessarily morose celibate. He was not moved to laughter or tears, he was neither Heraclitus nor Democritus. It was said of him, "il lui a manqué de pleurer." In literary criticism he was sanely but resolutely conservative, and in his reactions tended to tone down militant ideas and give them social amenity. Consequently, as an expression of the literature of *honnêtes gens*, the studies of La Bruyère, less bitter, though far from entirely benevolent, than the maxims of La Rochefoucauld, appealed to those who based their observations of life on the Classicism of

France. Addison certainly underwent the influence of La Bruyère.

The literary ancestry of La Bruyère's *Caractères* carries us back ultimately to Theophrastus, but his work is far more developed than its model and more personal. The characters of Theophrastus had something of the impersonality of the few types described by Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics;* La Bruyère, while feigning to depict universal types, depends largely on the observation of his contemporaries, who tried to give keys to his writings. He even sought to innovate boldly in decorous Classicism by realistic details, mentioning how a person spits or snores. He added a little of the elegant cynicism of a La Rochefoucauld.

In his critical attitude La Bruyère stands for a Classicism between that of Boileau and that of Fénelon. He is free from the dogmatism of the one; he has not the supple quality of Fénelon's letter to the Academy. In his judgments upon the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries one notes sundry divergences from Boileau. He appreciates the sixteenth century better, would like to revive some of its vocabulary, and sees the good in Ronsard. As regards his contemporaries, La Bruyère accomplished the uncommon feat of enunciating verdicts which, almost without exception, posterity has ratified. Under the influence of Plutarch's *Lives* he somewhat affected the artificial parallel or comparison of authors.

La Bruyère's moral views take most vivid form in the essay *De l'homme*. He admires that other student of man, Montaigne, and borrows over a score of his observations; he partakes of Montaigne's detached pyrrhonism, but does not go to its extremes. Rather, like La Fontaine, he is the moralist who observes. Hence, though the identification of his characters is not always possible, some were portraits of men of his time. In the literary fop Cydias people recognised his enemy the "*discret*" Fontenelle, in the warrior Æmile they saw the great Condé, in Théobalde Benserade. The very titles of the essays carry one

through the society of the day. The defect of La Bruyère to the modern reader is that the matter is cast in such general form that personal interest is now wanting. His writings have neither the abstractness of an ethical treatise nor the concreteness of a drawing from life. When he tries specifically to rival Molière, in opposing Onuphre to Tartuffe, his failure is marked.

In religion La Bruyère is an orthodox believer. He regrets the decadence of pulpit eloquence even among the contemporaries of Bossuet and Bourdaloue, and in the chapter *Des esprits forts* opposes the views of the sceptics with arguments based on Descartes and Malebranche. He attempts a Cartesian proof of the existence of God with the inference, "Je pense, donc Dieu existe," and in the wake of Pascal supports his reasoning by considerations of the insignificance of man and the majesty of Nature.

The doings of the Fronde had had their chronicler in the cardinal de Retz; the last years of the reign of Louis XIV were described by the duc de Saint-Simon. Louis de Saint-Simon was born only in 1675, and did not die until 1755, but his memoirs really stand for the seventeenth century.

Saint-Simon belonged to a family of quality, which had, however, only recently won royal patronage under Louis XIII, and, with a certain sensitiveness as to his prerogatives, he had all the arrogance of caste. After a period of military service he became a courtier at Versailles, and during the rest of the king's life he was never absent from the round of petty ceremonies which made up the court routine. But his aversion gradually increased for his royal master and the smug flatterers of the latter's old age, who scorned Saint-Simon's fertile but to them inopportune projects of political reform. After the death of Louis XIV, Saint-Simon, except for an embassy to Spain, failed to acquire even under the more favorably disposed regency the influence he desired. At the death of the regent in 1723 he withdrew from all active participation in affairs, and until his own death many years later he passed for a dissatisfied and haughty old nobleman,

buried in books and left stranded from a previous generation. Meanwhile he was drawing up his memoirs.

These he first began in 1694 when still a youth, but for some years he contented himself with a scrappy collection of material, until he took it into his head to develop Dangeau's *Journal*. This was an accurate but soulless record of facts, public and private, kept for thirty-six years by the marquis de Dangeau. It was about 1730 that Saint-Simon came into possession of Dangeau's diary through a friend who was the writer's grandson. Hot-tempered and prejudiced, he was irritated at the mediocrity of Dangeau's mind and his mechanical registration of facts. So Saint-Simon, about 1740, began the final version of his own memoirs, which were not published until 1829. Taking Dangeau as foundation, he goes over the same ground, sometimes copying, more often developing or inserting additional information, the result of more acute observation. All his life Saint-Simon had with alertness judged the characters of his fellows. This is, indeed, the weak as well as the strong point of Saint-Simon. His dislikes and prejudices, together with the lapses of memory natural to one writing many years after the events themselves, combine to make the memoirs constantly open to suspicion. Saint-Simon was a good hater, as his invectives show.

On the other hand, the writings of Saint-Simon, enlivened by anecdotes, have a picturesqueness that rarely appears among more sober memoirs. In vivid and often crude language he dashes off pen portraits of people with what must often be scandalous caricature, but which makes the men and women stand before us. Consequently, Saint-Simon is remote from the dignity of good form in his day. Together with the haughtiness of the semi-feudal *seigneur*, he has the touch of a modern Realist; or at any rate, with his plausible gossip and falsehood, he is a pseudo-Realist with a Romantic vocabulary of vituperation. Yet he is no stylist, and his language is slipshod.

Saint-Simon's memoirs give us a picture of life under the *Grand Monarque* very different from the grace which the

partisans of the old *régime* threw over it. It is a rich mine of material for those iconoclasts who like to upset tradition. One cannot read Saint-Simon without thinking of the passage in *Henry Esmond:*

I have seen in his old age and decrepitude the old French King Lewis the Fourteenth, the type and model of knighthood — who never moved but to measure, who lived and died according to the laws of his Court-marshal, persisting in enacting through life the part of Hero; and, divested of poetry, this was but a little wrinkled old man, pock-marked, and with a great periwig and red heels to make him look tall — a hero for a book if you like, or for a brass statue or a painted ceiling, a god in a Roman shape, but who more than a man for Madame Maintenon, or the barber who shaved him, or Monsieur Fagon, his surgeon? I wonder shall History ever pull off her periwig and cease to be court-ridden?

CHAPTER XVIII

LA FONTAINE AND THE POETS

THE poetry of the Classical age, outside the didactic or ethical literature of the drama, criticism and satire, was not abundant. The critic in the seventeenth century scarcely conceived that aspect of poetry which seems to us most important: the description and appreciation of nature. Said Saint-Evremond: "Un discours où l'on ne parle que de bois, de rivières, de prés, de campagnes, de jardins, fait sur nous une impression bien languissante, à moins qu'elle n'ait des agréments tout nouveaux. Ce qui est de l'humanité, les penchants, les affections, les tendresses, cela trouve naturellement au fond de notre âme à se faire sentir." Scarcely two or three poets were professed writers on nature. One was Mme Deshoulières, whom we have already considered and who expressed herself in the stock phraseology of previous pastoral literature. The other one alone, La Fontaine, knows nature at first hand, and is recognised to be, with Molière, the least conventional poet of the Classical school.

Jean de la Fontaine was born at Château-Thierry in Champagne in 1621. All his life he seemed to suffer from a sort of moral ataxia. He was utterly unable to govern himself and remained a child, the *bonhomme* La Fontaine. He went first to the religious seminary of the Oratoire, then left it to become his father's successor as *maître des eaux et forêts*, married a young girl, Marie Héricart, only to disregard her and pay more attention to literature and to other women than to his wife.

La Fontaine began by translating the *Eunuchus* of Terence: he had a liking for Latin literature, and his fondness for Ovid

comes out in many of his poems. Becoming a hanger-on of Fouquet, then the wealthy and influential *surintendant des finances*, he wrote miscellaneous light poems, but more particularly the pensioner's tributes, such as the *Songe de Vaux* and the *Elégie aux nymphes de Vaux*. La Fontaine's sloth made him dilatory in completing his literary tributes to an expectant patron, but at least one must credit him with fidelity to Fouquet after the latter's fall. He passed under the protection of the duchesse de Bouillon, and joined also the little group of friends consisting mainly of Racine, Molière, and Boileau. The last two had no little influence in chastening La Fontaine's style. He wrote the first ones of his *Contes*, indecent anecdotes in verse drawn from such sources as Boccaccio and the *fabliaux*. Then in 1668, when he was forty-seven, appeared the first six books of *Fables*, later continued by other books. He was for a while under the protection of Mme de la Sablière, and when her time came to withdraw from the world and devote herself to piety, she took, said she, but three things with her: her cat, her dog, and La Fontaine. After her death, the story goes, M. d'Hervart went to ask the poet to come to live with him. "I was just on my way to your house," answered La Fontaine.

He was elected to the Academy in 1683, at first in preference to Boileau, but the king adjourned his admission until Boileau had been taken in. He died in 1695 after an opportune repentance. During his later years an effort had been made to take him to England, where were the duchesse de Mazarin and Saint-Evremond, but the plan came to nothing.

This heedless and absent-minded *bonhomme* created or renewed a whole literary *genre*, though outside the bounds of Classical regularity and rather in what the French call the *gaulois* vein. Marot, Rabelais, Molière, La Fontaine, all express the popular spirit, humorous, satirical, sometimes indecent, untouched by Aristotle and Seneca. The *Contes*, in their filth, equal Rabelais. The fables, on the other hand, are for the most part graceful: a short narrative in which animals usually play the part

of men, but in some of which only human beings appear. He relates the anecdote succinctly and precedes it by a moral, or draws one from it. But the moral of a fable by La Fontaine is not of the nature of Sunday-school instruction. It is the result of observation of the times, and is dictated by self-interest. By doing this or that, you will win success, avoid disaster. La Fontaine merely records life as it is in his

> . . . ample comédie à cent actes divers,
> Et dont la scène est l'univers.

In the fables La Fontaine was at times original; more often he retold an old story whose genealogy went back to the Æsopic stories or even to the remote Orient. He had had predecessors, the oldest being probably quite unknown to him, in such writers as Marie de France, Marot or Baïf. Though Marot's *le Lion et le rat* is far superior to La Fontaine's rendering of the same story, yet no other writer of fables in France reaches his general level. His little legends, "figurines" they have been called, seem spontaneous and easy, yet they were carefully elaborated. It was Mme de Bouillon who called La Fontaine a "fablier," as though his writings came without effort or study, growing like the apples on their *pommier*. But La Fontaine himself asserts that his writings are the result of elaboration:

> Ce qui m'étonne est qu'à huit ans
> Un prince en fable ait mis la chose,
> Pendant que sous mes cheveux blancs,
> Je fabrique, *à force de temps*,
> Des vers moins sensés que sa prose.

He takes a subject and fills it in with the accessories of a work of art, considering even the effect of a single line, its rhythm, its length or brevity, and aiming to insinuate the precept without too much annoyance:

> Une morale nous apporte de l'ennui:
> Le conte fait passer le précepte avec lui.

In considering La Fontaine, who had so much more to do

with the outside world than his contemporaries, the question arises as to his love of animals and of nature. It has been maintained with some plausibility that he had no knowledge of natural history or of the characteristics of animals, because he often describes them as his predecessors did and attributes to them the traditional traits of mediæval fable and satire: the fox has the wiliness and cruelty of Renart; the cat is a hypocrite, "Grippeminaud le bon apôtre;" the bear is a dull-witted fool who, trying to crush a fly on his sleeping friend's face, takes a big stone and smashes in his skull. Moreover, La Fontaine's menagerie is not a varied one: a handful of domestic animals, with an admixture of less familiar beasts, such as the lion, the elephant, the ape, whom he knew mainly through literature. La Fontaine was no seventeenth-century Buffon, though we are told that he was given to idling away his unnumbered days watching an ant-hill or the movement of birds. It matters little, therefore, for literary purposes, if he is convicted of making a grasshopper live all summer instead of a few weeks, or the ant selfish instead of social in its habits, or a fox eat cheese, or a suckling lamb go unaccompanied to a brook. He certainly did care for animals, though he may not have progressed far in accurate knowledge of them, and he defended them against the Cartesians, who, as Malebranche did, maintained that animals are mere machines. To the Cartesians the idea of God was involved in the question of the soul of animals: If animals have a soul, God does not exist. For if they had a soul, they would suffer, and suffering being the punishment of sin, they would be punished unjustly. But there is no unjust God, hence animals have no souls.

Ils disent donc
Que la bête est une machine;
Qu'en elle tout se fait sans choix et par ressorts:
Nul sentiment, point d'âme; en elle tout est corps.
Telle est la montre qui chemine
A pas toujours égaux, aveugle et sans dessein.
Ouvrez-la, lisez dans son sein:

Mainte roue y tient lieu de tout l'esprit du monde;
La première y meut la seconde;
Une troisième suit: elle sonne à la fin.
Au dire de ces gens la bête est toute telle.

On the contrary, in the partridge luring the hunter away from her young, La Fontaine sees no mere reflex but an active intelligence.

As to outer nature, La Fontaine differs from most of his contemporaries. Those were the days of the landscape architecture of Le Nôtre and the gardens of Versailles and Marly, when lawns (*tapis verts*) and trees were arranged to imitate drawing-rooms, when the geometrical figure with straight lines was considered the ideal of beauty, when quiet Port-Royal seemed a solitude and desolation. But La Fontaine understood real nature; not, it is true, wild mountains like the Alps or broad rivers. But he did know the delights of a smiling country side, the fertility of the Ile-de-France with the *aurore*, the *thym* and the *rosée*. And he knows more of all trees and flowers than do the courtiers of Louis XIV.

Yet it was one of the nature lovers of the eighteenth century, Rousseau, who vehemently attacked La Fontaine's fables on the ground that, thought and reflection having brought woes upon mankind, it is unbecoming to attribute to animals the defects of humanity and set bad examples to children, who are too immature to understand them.

But La Fontaine saw in animals lessons for men: "Je me sers d'animaux pour instruire les hommes." Taine, in his study of La Fontaine, sees men themselves and thinks that La Fontaine is, like Boileau, a satirist of his age. This is, perhaps, carrying the idea rather far. But it is none the less true that his animals, consciously or unconsciously, act as the men of the time. In the lion is to be seen the king, grave and severe, bored by the etiquette of Versailles, but conscientiously carrying out his tasks. Several animals stand for the courtier as he appears in Saint-Simon, obsequious and insincere. Then there is the rustic

provincial *hobereau*, the bear, or the fly playing the busybody and *fâcheux* like the *petit marquis* of Molière, or the thrifty *bourgeois* art, and many more besides.

La Fontaine's fables are in irregular metre, *vers libres*, wherein he is more original than in his choice of subjects. Instead of using the monotonous alexandrine of Boileau's one or two experiments in fables, his metre has the freedom which suits his subjects: he is "volage" in verse as in love. He seems to have no rule but harmony: A long and heavy verse suits a long drawn out description, a quick and skipping line suits a brisk subject. In language, too, La Fontaine goes beyond the bounds of seventeenth-century Classicism and often uses the richer vocabulary of the sixteenth-century writers.

La Fontaine, though the greatest, was not the only fable writer of his time, whether in prose or verse: there were Benserade, Furetière, Perrault, Fénelon, the P. Bouhours. Ménage and the P. Bouhours wrote them in Latin.

Aside from the writings of La Fontaine already mentioned, his chief works were comedies and lyrical plays, miscellaneous compositions on Cupid and Psyche or Adonis, besides verse epistles, elegies, odes, *chansons* and similar trifles.

The other so-called poets do not amount to much, and their numbers diminish as the century goes on. Brébeuf is chiefly known by his translation of Lucan's *Pharsalia*. Isaac de Benserade's life stretches through nearly the whole century (1612–1691), he had written plays, had been the friend of Richelieu and Mazarin, had composed ballets during the minority of Louis XIV, and had participated in the great poetical war with Voiture, with his *Job* against his rival's *Uranie*. But it was not until 1674 that Benserade became a member of the Academy, and not until 1676 that he published his version of the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid turned into *rondeaux*. It will be remembered that Mascarille in Molière's *Précieuses* was turning the history of Rome into madrigals.

Jean Regnault de Segrais, another long-lived author (1624–

1701) and a poetaster also, was a meritorious composer of that "poésie galante et enjouée," which with its smooth flow, its gentle flattery or satire, its playful tenderness, its trifling with love, its general atmosphere of good breeding, made it seem to the people of the period to have reached a permanence that the shifting standards of time have completely upset. Segrais was for a time secretary of the Grande Mademoiselle, and afterwards the friend of Mme de la Fayette, lending her his name for the publication of her books. He wrote some short stories or *nouvelles*, but his best work is to be found in his pastoral poem of *Athis* and in his free imitations or translations of Virgil.

Chaulieu and La Fare are usually linked together in literary history. They are insignificant writers, but good representatives of the lighter vein which had earlier shown itself in the tavern poets, and which now, polished by the influences at work, expressed the epicureanism and trifling of the libertine society of the Temple.

PART IV

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

CHAPTER I

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

THE thought of the early eighteenth century is expressed by men like Bayle and Fontenelle. These writers stand for the rationalistic, the mathematical interpretation of science which existed in that age. In the early seventeenth century the philosopher had been the physicist, whether materialist like Gassendi, empiricist like Pascal, *a priori* reasoner like Descartes. In the second part of the seventeenth century the spirit of the age tended to lay emphasis on the mathematical side, though with a gradually new diathesis as a result of truer study of the laws of universal mechanics following the investigations of Sir Isaac Newton. In France in the eighteenth century the whole conception of science was permeated with mathematics. Writers no longer prided themselves on the pomp of their sententious periods or on an easy conversational style, but rather on a brief, sharp phrase known as the *style coupé*, in which each word had its definite connotation and was almost a mathematical symbol.[1] The result was helpful to clearness of expression, but it was disastrous to the manifestation of the half lights and tones of poetical thought which seeks a wealth of figurative language that the eighteenth century could not give. The mathematical propensity even made its way into the realm of the emotions,

[1] Toward the end of the century, it is true, among the descriptive poets and lyrical pseudo-Pindarists there was a particular fondness for a *style orné* consisting of *alliances de mots*, the conjunction of startling and unexpected words, presenting often false metaphors and incomplete similes but intended to awaken suggestions of other poets, to represent the incoherence of lyric enthusiasm, or merely to *épater*.

and love was spoken of in terms of arithmetic and geometry. It was Voltaire's friend Francesco Algarotti, author of dialogues upon Newton's philosophy (*Newtonianismo per le dame*), who spoke of love decreasing in the ratio of the square of time and the cube of distance, and Mme de Staal-Delaunay told of the admirer who used at first to take her to walk round the sides of a square, but later cut diagonally across the ground, whence she inferred that his love had diminished in the ratio of the hypotenuse to the sides of a right-angled triangle.[1] Algarotti's work is an indication of another tendency of learning — the popularisation of science and its adaptation to non-technical readers. Erudition was apt to be turned into dialogue, perhaps with a lady of fashion, and so Fontenelle's exposition of astronomy is in the form of conversations with a *marquise*.

This was not the only philosophical manifestation proceeding to a large degree from Cartesian rationalism. The quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns was but an instance of the feeling of constant progress toward indefinite perfectibility in thinkers ranging from the abbé de Saint-Pierre to Condorcet and the Ideologists. The spirit of the age being scientific and facilitating the idea that learning is a constant accretion, it resulted that the moral and political theories were stamped with the notion of rational amelioration. The feeling of the perfectibility of man is the successor of the realisation of the dignity of man, the "coming to self-consciousness," of the Renaissance and the Reformation.

Still another form of thought had its origin in earlier traditions, though it came, not from Descartes alone, but from the opposite school as well. This was the rejection of authority which Classicism had imposed on all the categories of the mind.

[1] So Houdar de la Motte:

A la géométrie en vain je veux toucher:
Depuis qu'en ses mystères j'entre,
J'apprends seulement que vous êtes mon centre,
Et que je tourne autour sans pouvoir l'approcher.

Under Louis XIV anything irregular in literary theory was frowned upon, and religious unconventionality was persecuted in the Jansenists as in the Huguenots. The new tendency, taking in its acute manifestations the form of philosophical doubt, went back to the school of Montaigne. It had been upheld by the libertines, from the tavern poets to the irreligious epicureans of Ninon's group and of the Temple. The spirit of denial was again raised to the dignity of a philosophical creed by Bayle whose system was to have no system.

The result of these tendencies away from the concentrated and dogmatic Classicism made the eighteenth century more comprehensive in its views of life and sympathetic in its relations with other countries. Instead of being a period of narrow nationalism, even if admired by other nations, it became an age of innovation and of experiment, of cosmopolitanism, during which authors borrowed without reserve from beyond the frontiers and extended sympathy to all doctrines.[1] It went far beyond not only the literary conservatism of the previous century, but also the confines of revealed religion, and opened the way for materialism, scepticism, and atheism. In technical *belles lettres* alone, lyric poetry (such as it was), tragedy, or criticism, the Academy, packed with mediocre bishops, abbés, or pedants like d'Olivet and Batteux, asserted the old authority of cut and dried rules. The seventeenth century Classicism had become a mere pseudo-Classicism, *nominis umbra*.

On many subjects the eighteenth century was as mistaken as the seventeenth had been, for its theories were based on as insecure foundations: erroneous assumptions as to the laws of human nature or social organisms.[2] Results in the eighteenth

[1] "Le dix-septième siècle voyait Versailles, le dix-huitième voit la terre." (Michelet, Introduction to *la Régence*.)

[2] M. Lanson, who has of late devoted much time to the eighteenth century, is now inclined to think that the *a priori* tendencies of the eighteenth century have been exaggerated, and modifies his history of French literature accordingly, in the eleventh edition. But he rather destroys his own

century did not coincide with the utopian hopes or did so, in the Revolution, only by the help of the guillotine.

Though the eighteenth century is so different from the seventeenth, the transition was normal. It began with social reaction against restraint. The gloomy days of Louis XIV were over, and the court, throwing off the mask of hypocrisy, revelled under the regency in unbridled license of thought and morals. In literature the cynicism and cold-blooded selfishness of the past and present age find vent in hardness and unsentimentality, with an assumption of smartness and epigrammatic satire. In thought the cult of reason spreads to all spheres of intellectual activity. Cartesianism becomes less orthodox and theorises to its full satisfaction. The descendants of the libertines also state views deviating more and more from tradition. Thus it is not necessary to look to England alone for the origin of deism or unbelief, inasmuch as we can find in French writers like Bayle, Saint-Evremond, or Fontenelle, in less famous ones like Richard Simon, as well as in obscurer works, indications of a rationalism which paves the way for the rejection of revelation and the proclamation of deism.[1] By 1715 or thereabout Cartesianism, scepticism, epicureanism, as well as Protestant independence of judgment, had produced an attitude of hostility to dogma of which deism was the expression. Only a few immediately went on to atheism. The majority were satisfied with a feeling of toleration for all beliefs and a sense of the underlying unity of religions.

At the same time morals were gradually separated from religion and secularised. Heterodox thinkers established their

case by also adding (p. 628): "On ne savait pas encore tout ce qu'il faut de patience, de scrupule, de précaution, pour se procurer une observation bien prise. On crut observer et l'on supposa. On fabriqua des idées, et l'on crut opérer sur des faits. On prit une idéologie pour un corps de vérités d'expérience."

[1] On such works as *la Terre Australe* of Gabriel de Foigny and the *Histoire des Sévarambes*, cf. Lanson in the *Revue des Cours et Conférences*, March 12 and April 2, 1908.

ethics on heterodox principles, on a social or a rational basis rather than on divine legislation. Hence the talk of the "morale des honnêtes gens" or of systems reasoned out for the common good and constructed according to the inventor's bias by *a priori* principles or by *a posteriori* observation of the defects of existing institutions.

The result is the *philosophes*. They do not represent a single group or even necessarily stand for technical philosophic thought. The term no longer implied sequestered students of metaphysics. The eighteenth-century philosophers were rather men of the world, writers of plays, novels, and poems. The title was the common denomination assumed by all the partisans of advanced thought and those who proclaimed the right of reason to rebel against authority. Less numerous in the first half of the century, they became, as they rallied round the *Encyclopedia*, a vast and widely differentiated group of thinkers united chiefly by their opposition to the Church. They united in their contempt the "superstitions" of the past, like the cult of the Sacred Heart and the mysticism of Marie Alacoque, or the contemporary manifestations of religious frenzy, such as the excesses of the Jansenist *convulsionnaires*. They gradually grew more powerful even in the Academy, where under Duclos and d'Alembert they overpowered the *dévots* as they called their foes. Epic contests were fought over important elections, and unfortunates such as Le Franc de Pompignan were made the scapegoats of bigger issues and the playthings of greater men as in *les Quand* of Voltaire and *les Si* and *les Pourquoi* of Morellet.

In this struggle between the *philosophes* and the *dévots* all the great arguments were used which the men of the Revolution repeated, and all the abuses were uncovered which the Revolution planned to correct. It has, therefore, been customary to attribute to the *philosophes* the chief cause of that outbreak. On the other hand, some writers have tried to deprive them of any such important part on the ground that the economic evils of the old régime were notorious before the great days of the

philosophes, and that there were threats of revolution as early as 1753. It is none the less true that there was no revolution then and that the real one would not have come in the form it took had it not been prepared by the *philosophes*.[1]

In the sphere of pure letters the condition was different and the content of the literature of the imagination dwindles greatly. There was little place for it in an age which prided itself on rationalism and effervescence. It was Voltaire who called the French the "whipped cream of Europe." The aim of the French, then as now, was to be the centre to which civilisation converges, and they could no longer, as in the seventeenth century, entirely give without taking. M. Faguet says that the seventeenth century had been religious and French, the eighteenth century was neither religious nor French.

But the influence of France on other countries was largely due to the literature of the preceding century. Its diffusion had been aided by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, which drove broadcast over Europe more than four hundred thousand of the most industrious and intelligent Frenchmen. Many went to England and, sometimes starting as hackwriters, acquired reputations, as did Desmaizeaux the editor of Saint-Evremond, Motteux the translator of Rabelais, Boyer, Leclerc the journalist, Rapin Thoyras the historian, Coste the translator of Locke. The Dutch colony was no less important and played a significant part in disseminating thought.

The French themselves travelled to England. Destouches, Montesquieu, and Buffon went there; the abbé Prévost lived in

[1] The influence of the *philosophes* upon the Revolution is well expressed by Albert Sorel in his work on *l'Europe et la Révolution française* (Vol. I, p. 204) quoted by Charles-Brun (*Le Roman social en France au XIXe siècle*): "Les philosophes apportent à la révolution que les fautes du gouvernement ont préparée, des chefs, des cadres, une doctrine, une direction, l'entraînement des illusions, l'irrésistible élan des espérances. Ils ne créent pas les causes de cette révolution, ils les manifestent, ils les animent, ils les passionnent, ils les multiplient, ils en précipitent le développement."

England and did his best to popularise its thought in his own land. Similarly Voltaire discovered Shakspere, studied Newton, came in contact with the English deists, and wrote his *Lettres anglaises*, the most important document in the early growth of eighteenth-century philosophism. To this movement the introduction into France of freemasonry contributed not a little.

Other authors, Rousseau, though he went to England late in life, and Diderot, who never went, were as important in the history of the English influence. Diderot was permeated with England in his scientific writings and in his fiction and dramas drawn from Sterne, Richardson, and Lillo. Rousseau was no less steeped in the deism of Pope and the sentiment of Clarissa Harlowe when he wrote the *Nouvelle Héloïse* and *Emile*. The "homme sensible" ready to burst into tears was the favorite in fiction and in life.[1] *Robinson Crusoe* had been translated almost as soon as published; the essays of Addison and Steele were read by the moralising *bourgeoisie;* finally, the poets, Thomson, Gray, Young, the Ossianic literature, all became popular in France and encouraged the cult of descriptive poetry, the love of nature, and the feeling for melancholy. English phrases,

[1] Mme. Dupin de Francueil, the grandmother of George Sand, tells of meeting Rousseau for the first time: "J'aperçois un petit homme assez mal vêtu et comme renfrogné, qui se levait lourdement, qui mâchonnait des mots confus. Je le regarde et je devine; je crie, je veux parler, je fonds en larmes. Jean-Jacques, étourdi de cet accueil, veut me remercier et fond en larmes. Francueil veut nous remettre l'esprit par une plaisanterie et fond en larmes. Nous ne pûmes nous rien dire. Rousseau me serra la main et ne m'adressa pas une parole. On essaya de dîner pour couper court à tous ces sanglots." (Quoted in Doumic's *George Sand.*) Similarly, Ginguené, the historian of Italian literature and poet, wrote in his Diary, as late as the first Empire: "J'ai fait, pour le jour de naissance de mon cher petit James, une pièce de vers qui a touché ceux qui l'ont entendue ou lue, parce que j'étais moi-même très touché en la faisant. Ce cher enfant, quand je la lui ai récitée à table, s'est levé de sa place et est venu se jeter dans mes bras en fondant en larmes. Ma femme, ses amies, tout le monde pleurait, et moi aussi." (Quoted by Potez: *l'Elégie en France avant le romantisme.*)

customs, and fashions were all in vogue, and even French formal gardening after the style of Le Nôtre lost favor before the simplicity of the *jardin anglais* with meandering and shady paths, arbors, and grottoes or "temples."[1]

Meanwhile in England the school of Boileau was still powerful, and the translations of novels as old as those of La Calprenède were read until the days of Richardson. French influence was strong in Spain and in Italy. The Spanish Academy imitated the Académie française; Goldoni lived in Paris; Alfieri, though he disliked France, was influenced by French thinkers. From Russia the empress Catherine sent for Diderot, and Frederick the Great had at Berlin Voltaire, Maupertuis, and La Mettrie. Germany, however, which had, through the school of Gottsched, been saturated with the doctrines of Boileau,[2] was destined in the second half of the eighteenth century to repay its debts. Through Winckelmann it modified the conception of antiquity. It contributed Grimm to French literature and spread the reputation of Gellert, Haller, and Gessner, particularly the last. Haller increased the knowledge of nature, Gessner popularised scenes of rustic virtue and simplicity. Meanwhile, greater writers like Klopstock, Lessing, Wieland had far less vogue in France. Goethe's *Werther* was the most read book of the great writers.

In spite of this new state of literature, far different from that of the reign of Louis XIV, the rule of France in intellectual matters seemed so established that in 1783 the Berlin Academy offered its famous prize for an essay on the reasons for the universality of French, which Rivarol won with his *Discours sur l'universalité de la langue française*.

[1] The American Revolution introduced a temporary fad of Americanism and the cult of the "embattled farmer." Society played "boston" and men wore coats *à la Franklin*.

[2] Intellectually, Gottsched is to be classed with d'Aubignac or Rymer rather than with Boileau.

CHAPTER II

BAYLE AND FONTENELLE

BAYLE and Fontenelle were two philosophers of the transition age, the first of whom worked quietly and with little concern for popularity, but achieved a more permanent effect, the second was the *femme de chambre* of a feminised science dressed out in frills and furbelows.

Pierre Bayle was born in 1647 at Le Carla, on the slopes of the Pyrenees, where his father was a Protestant minister, and died in 1706 at Rotterdam. During his youth he was for about eighteen months a convert to Catholicism, but returned as a result of deliberate criticism to his previous creed. Because of his lapse from the official faith he became practically an exile and spent the rest of his life abroad, at Geneva, Sedan, and in Holland. There he was the chief literary and critical influence of the generation, though he never evolved a constructive system. During his period of wandering Bayle was a private tutor in several noble families and at the Protestant academy of Sedan occupied the chair of philosophy until the institution was closed by the king. In 1681, at Rotterdam, he was made professor of philosophy and history at the *Ecole illustre*, founded practically for him and the theologian Jurieu. From this date begins his great literary activity.

At Sedan, Bayle had published some philosophical treatises on ethics and physics still tinged with the hypotheses and methods of Cartesianism. At Rotterdam he first showed the bias of his criticism in the *Pensées sur la comète*, suggested by the appearance in 1680 of a comet which had caused an outburst of popular superstition. These prejudices he attacked, showing

how they are rooted in the credulity of man, the blind respect for authority and tradition, but yield before rational criticism. More particularly he seized on the belief that comets are divine omens as an occasion to attack miracles and to maintain that atheism is no worse than idolatry: nothing hinders the atheist from being a righteous man; faith and morals are not necessarily correlative. In this work Bayle already shows two of the most marked tendencies of his thought: destructive criticism and the separation of morals from religion.

This work was followed by the *Critique générale de l'histoire du calvinisme de M. Maimbourg*. The P. Maimbourg had fought the reformed religion with great violence, but Bayle, instead of refuting his arguments individually, attacked religious intolerance and the sectarianism which hindered it from seeing any good in its opponents. Thus Bayle rose above his own coreligionaries who were, on the whole, as intolerant as the Catholics. He himself tried to discredit his adversary by a sceptical attitude to his representative assertions and argued that true religion must not bring constraint to bear on those who are not of the same belief. This eloquent outburst in favor of religious freedom, followed soon after by some *Nouvelles lettres*, came not long before the revocation of the Edict of Nantes and persecutions which hastened the death of his own brother.

In 1684 Bayle began the publication of a monthly periodical, the *Nouvelles de la République des lettres*, destined to be a regular review of the important new publications, particularly in history, philosophy, science, and religion. By means of this journalistic undertaking, which he continued alone until 1687, Bayle acquired an importance which his secluded life otherwise never would have given, and he entered into communication with nearly all the distinguished men of the day.

The persecutions in France caused the publication in 1686 of *Ce que c'est que la France toute catholique sous le règne de Louis le Grand* and of the *Commentaire philosophique sur ces paroles*

de Jésus-Christ, "Contrains-les d'entrer." The one speaks for the liberty of conscience, the other renews arguments already made against conversions by force. Unfortunately the unorthodox liberality of Bayle's views brought down on him the fury of his fellow-Protestants led by his former friend, the sectarian and vindictive Calvinist Jurieu. Their quarrel was marked by bitter publications in the course of which Jurieu accused Bayle of atheism. Finally, Bayle was deprived of his salary and his position.

It was a serious blow to Bayle, yet it enabled him to devote his undivided attention to his great *Dictionnaire historique et critique*. This, indeed, is not the only one of his remaining works — his controversies involved a voluminous correspondence and writings like the *Continuation des pensées diverses*, the *Réponses aux questions d'un provincial*, the *Entretiens de Maxime et de Thémiste* — but it is the most elaborate and engrossing of all. Bayle gave up various offers of protection which might have stood in the way of his independence and spent his remaining days mainly in the composition of the dictionary. Already in 1692 he had published a *Projet;* in 1697 appeared the first volume of the work, which he continued and which was enlarged and republished several times after his death. It was mainly historical and biographical rather than a synthesis of the sciences like the later *Encyclopedia*, and took partly as its starting-point the historical dictionary of Moréri. This enabled him to use more insidiously but more tellingly than ever his critical and sceptical method. Bayle did not merely heap up the results of indefatigable study; he gradually passed from the mere rectification of mistakes in his predecessors to the state of mind which made him try to undermine the theories of those among his subjects for whom he lacked sympathy. The method of criticism is an indirect one, and the author's attack was often hidden in apparently insignificant detail, but it consistently advanced the claims of rationalism and opposed, as based on insufficient authority, many forms of custom, tradition, and prejudice.

It is obvious that Bayle's theories are not systematic, but

appear in many different places. To draw a system from him the student must undertake a process of logical co-ordination upon which Bayle himself scarcely ventured. His process was one of consistent denial, but he necessarily let inconsistency creep in: like Montaigne, Bayle complained of a lack of memory. Plutarch and Montaigne had been Bayle's favorite reading in youth, and it is the pyrrhonism of Montaigne carried to the extent of mental irresolution which characterises his work. Yet, inasmuch as the one principle that he firmly manifests is that of contradiction, his work does have a scientific foundation. In his writings on dogmatic religion and the restraints it imposes he was the advocate of moral and intellectual tolerance. In his historical studies he again tested authority and tradition. In both spheres he manifested a scepticism of the reason, which is a form of criticism, in order to overthrow cruelty and error.

Bayle meets every affirmation, as did Montaigne, with a demand for evidence; yet to him even evidence may be fallacious, and truth itself, because of bias or party-spirit, is often only relative. Truth is rather to be found in the facts of history rationally interpreted than in the *a priori* reasonings of metaphysics, where a dogmatic first principle is veiled in imaginative accretions. Bayle here took a contrary stand from the Cartesians to whom an ontological proof of the existence of God was more valid than a concrete fact of history.

In religion Bayle was against the excessive dogmatism both of the Catholics, with their doctrine of the infallibility of the Church, and of the Calvinists, with their doctrine of the infallibility of Holy Writ. By this last attitude he angered Jurieu, and by both attitudes he opens the way for modern religious exegesis in which Richard Simon had stirred up the wrath of Bossuet.

Bayle was undoubtedly led in his hostility to prejudice partly by the religious persecutions of his own times. Religious speculation seeming otiose, he tried to substitute a new principle. This he found in the sphere of practical morals. Belief in a creed was unessential: society could exist without religion. The

true principle is moral righteousness. It followed that no "truth" should be imposed by constraint, that the conscience should be free, that tolerance of all sects should prevail everywhere, that morals rest on a secular instead of a religious basis. It followed also that even atheism could have its *locus standi*. Hence Bayle was himself accused of atheism, though he was neither atheist nor believer, but merely a critic approaching all problems with a practical bias and with the tool of destructive reason. He does lead in others, by denying the intervention of a personal God in human affairs, to the deism which stamps the philosophy of the eighteenth century, and for which Bayle is so largely responsible. He helps to lift philosophy to a position co-ordinate with religion and hostile to it. He popularises philosophy and makes it accessible to literature. The *philosophes* found a rich mine in Bayle, and he gave Voltaire not only a wealth of information, but set a model for his religious satire.

It is in the dictionary that Bayle's unsystematic erudition and mocking fancy find especial vent. Wherever tradition has resulted in judgment or opinion he uses his subtle sarcasm. By an anecdote, a note, a quaint and amusing example, he shows how history is vitiated by preconceived theories. He ranges from ancient to modern history, destroying the vanity of nations or the pride of individuals, and emphasising the fateful results which often derive from an insignificant cause.

But it is in relation to the Bible that Bayle becomes truly malicious. He delights to point out contradictions, to show the opposition between miracles and the laws of nature, even, by an article such as that on David, to prove the immorality of the Bible. He dwelt on the immoral side of his topics with a certain gloating pleasure which has caused him to be charged with filthiness of mind, but which may be only the cerebrations of a recluse leading a life of chastity.[1]

[1] Bayle said it was in order to sell his works more easily, and there is no filthiness in his correspondence. The literary obscenity of Gibbon is influenced by Bayle.

If Bayle influenced thought in its deeper phases, his contemporary and survivor the centenarian Fontenelle, whose memories in the middle of the eighteenth century carried him back to the *grand siècle*, was an instance of the populariser who gave the twist to outer forms of current opinion.

Bernard le Bovier de Fontenelle (1657 — 1757) was a Norman and a nephew of Corneille. His health all his life was frail, which necessitated discreetness of régime, and the effect seems to have shown itself in his character: he was known as "le discret Fontenelle." He was the graceful wit and polished man of the world who found constant favor in the drawing-rooms. Fontenelle began his career practically by journalism in connection with his uncle Thomas Corneille's *Mercure galant*. He also collaborated with Thomas Corneille in a couple of operas, *Psyché* and *Bellérophon*, but when he tried a tragedy, *Aspar*, and a comedy, *la Comète*, his failure was ignominious. Not discouraged he wrote the *Dialogues des morts*, a far more serious bit of literary and philosophical thought, followed, however, by the frivolous *Lettres galantes du chevalier d'Her . . .*, which had a greater success than their insignificance deserved. Now in full vogue he contributed to Bayle's periodical, among other writings, a *Mémoire sur le nombre neuf* or a satirical and allegorical *Relation de l'île de Bornéo*, or he wrote his more ambitious *Entretiens sur la pluralité des mondes* (1686), the *Doutes sur les causes occasionnelles* directed against Malebranche, or the *Histoire des oracles* (1687) based on a Latin work of the Dutchman Van Dale and foreshadowing the eighteenth-century satirical irreverence. He composed also various eclogues.

Fontenelle's ambitions to become a member of the Academy were complicated by his sympathies with his uncle Thomas Corneille and the party of the Moderns (*Digression sur les anciens et les modernes*). But his name was more closely connected with the Academy of Sciences of which he was made life-secretary, and of which he wrote the history as well as the *Eloges* of the various members who died. And such a list is far from exhausting the

fecundity even of Fontenelle's later years when he wrote his life of Corneille, his *Réflexions sur la poétique*, besides many other miscellaneous productions all through his life.

Fontenelle showed people how to be superficial with grace. Everything is possible, he would say, and everybody is right. For that reason he had a wide influence in literature, philosophy, and science. So La Bruyère described him: "Entrez dans son magasin, il y a à choisir; prose ou vers, que voulez-vous? Cydias réussit également l'un et l'autre." He gave forth his wares with due consciousness of his dignity; he did not know what emotion was, but passed serenely and undisturbed through life. He was the philosophical squire of dames such as Mme de Lambert, Mme Geoffrin, and Mme de Tencin, and J.-B. Rousseau said of him:

> Il n'est caillette en honnête maison
> Qui ne se pâme à sa douce faconde;
> En vérité caillettes ont raison,
> C'est le plus joli pédant du monde.

Fontenelle's literary tastes carried him back almost to the *Astrée* and, beginning as a Norman provincial, he haunted the midway heights of novels such as the *Grand Cyrus* or the plays of Thomas Corneille. His pastorals and eclogues are full of *bel esprit*. He had no conception of poetry, except as a fantastic juggling with pretty tags and phrases, a task which he thought on the whole less worthy than writing in prose, the better vehicle for expressing man's nobler task of philosophising.

As a prose writer himself, Fontenelle, lacking in inspiration and feeling, was again weak in the forms which call for those qualities. It was only as a disembodied critic that his views on poetry, though unacceptable today and bad in their application, have at any rate the authority of clear and systematic reasoning. In the quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns he restates the common view of the Moderns that if trees today are as great as those of antiquity and our brains as rich in convolutions as those of Homer or Plato, we are today better than they were.

As a philosopher the Cartesian Fontenelle carries the spirit of rationalism to logical conclusions scarcely imagined by the founder of the system. It is not merely that the abstractions which masquerade under the names of mortals in the *Dialogues des morts* are pure rationalists, but in his latent scepticism as well as in the frank criticism of the *Origine des fables* and the *Histoire des oracles* Fontenelle helped to pave the way for the positive unbelief of the *philosophes*.

But it was as a philosophical scientist that Fontenelle was in his day most admired. He could expound cosmology so that the man in the street, or rather the *marquise* in her *salon*, could understand. Thus he contributed to make the scientific and the non-religious attitude prevalent in social as well as in learned circles and to spread the feeling that geometrical reasoning could ultimately unlock all the secrets of the universe. All this was fatal to the imagination and contributed to the dryness of the literature of the eighteenth century. But it was almost as potent as the influence of Bayle in creating the incredulity of the age, the irreverence of Voltaire, the unbelief of the Encyclopedists.

CHAPTER III

THE ESPRIT OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY
THE SALONS. JOURNALISTS

THE influence of women is no less marked in the eighteenth century than it had been in the seventeenth, and the *salons* reach a still greater development, passing as time goes on through at least three phases. In the early part of the century the *salons* retain some of the stilted dignity of the age of Louis XIV, which finds expression in the subtle analyses of Mme de Lambert's set, called by unfriendly critics her "lambertinage." This gave way about the middle of the century to a more restless intellectualism, fond of paradox and eager for philosophical and religious novelty. Finally, towards the advent of the Revolution, the *salons* were given over to political dissertations. More particularly in the second half of the century the *salons* and the *cafés* reflected the great questions under discussion by the philosophers, the economists and the patriots, who successively sought the millennium, the philosophers by enunciating the progress to perfection, the economists by seeking to remedy current defects, and the patriots by trying to sweep away the whole of society in order to replace it by a new one.

It was not long before the *esprit de société* became more than a mere drawing-room appurtenance. The social manifestations spread from the narrow and intellectual aristocracy to the nation at large; clubs and public gatherings were devoted to effervescent conversation. Galiani called Paris the "Coffee-house of Europe": we are told that as early as 1715 there were over three hundred *cafés* there. There were the *café Procope*, the *café* of the veuve Laurent, the *café Gradot*, the *café du Parnasse*, the *café de la Régence*. Coffee-drinking was wide-spread, and Vol-

taire's cups of coffee are as famous as Dr. Johnson's tea. The *cafés* took the place of the seventeenth-century *cabarets* and afforded a meeting place for men of letters before or after the play. The more frequented were the centres of different cliques, and were a nursery for the development of sophistry and paradox. The convivial and epicurean poets also had their gastronomic and bibulous literary societies, such as the *Caveau*, particularly the first one founded by Piron and Crébillon fils and the second one of Marmontel and Pelletier.

Every matter had to be dealt with wittily, and, as philosophy encroached upon everything, the intellectual strain was great. Montesquieu's *Esprit des lois* had to be brilliant enough to justify Mme du Deffand in calling it "de l'esprit sur les lois." The wit of the eighteenth century, whether expressed in an epigram by Piron or an anecdote by Chamfort, was brisk and sparkling, but essentially sarcastic and *méchant*, without respect for equals, without reverence for superiors. Even in its most mellow form it finds a typical illustration in the heedless epicureanism of the abbé de Lattaignant's farewell to the world:

J'aurai bientôt quatre-vingts ans,
Je crois qu'à cet âge il est temps
  De dédaigner la vie.
Aussi je la perds sans regret,
Et je fais gaîment mon paquet:
  Bonsoir, la compagnie.

J'ai goûté de tous les plaisirs:
J'ai perdu jusqu'aux désirs;
  A présent je m'ennuie.
Lorsque l'on n'est plus bon à rien
On se retire, et l'on fait bien:
  Bonsoir, la compagnie.

In their loftier flights the intellects of the eighteenth century took delight, after the time of Bayle, in the assumption of liberty and toleration, and showed intolerance only for Christianity. Society was full of unfrocked and apostate priests, or of abbés

who, still bearing their titles, were atheists and materialists at heart. As Voltaire in his *Œdipe* attacked the priests, so Montesquieu expressed his satire by his *Lettres persanes*, or the abbé de Saint-Pierre planned reconstructions of society and projects of perfect peace. These schemes were facilitated by the tendency to consider man as an abstract entity and not as something at least partly influenced by his environment. Consequently he could be theorised upon at will, regardless of the real consequences. In this we have an excellent instance of the French tendency for *a priori* generalisation. The *Club de l'entresol*, in the earlier half of the century, met to discuss moral and political questions under the presidency of the abbé de Saint-Pierre (expelled from the Academy for his *Discours sur la Polysynodie*, a project for reforms), to read French and foreign gazettes, to talk about the freer government of England, and to converse with those who had been to that happy land. Thus, years before the Revolution, the seed of discontent was being unconsciously sown in a soil more and more ready for the labors of the economists and the iconoclasts.

The type of the early period was the *salon* of Mme de Lambert (1647–1733), a *bureau d'esprit* which after 1710, when she was already elderly, became such a centre of intrigue and influence that it was called the "antichambre de l'Académie." The intellectual atmosphere was dignified, the moral tone eminently proper, except in so far as some of its frequenters were in thought innovators. Mme de Lambert had two distinct sets meeting on different days of the week, the one of people of quality, the other of literary men and women. At Mme de Lambert's were to be seen Fontenelle, the president Hénault, the marquis d'Argenson, Mme Dacier, Mlle Delaunay (Mme de Staal-Delaunay), but the divinity of the group was Houdar de la Motte. Mme de Lambert herself did a little writing, such as the *Avis d'une mère à son fils*, the *Avis d'une mère à sa fille*, not to mention miscellaneous *Réflexions*, *Discours*, letters, and so forth.

The propriety of Mme de Lambert's *salon* was a conscious

reaction against the laxness of many other notorious groups. There was, for instance, the libertine set of the Temple, where the prior Philippe de Vendôme had his famous suppers with boon companions like Chaulieu, the "Anacréon du Temple," or the youthful Voltaire and many of the ancestors of eighteenth-century irreligion. Often these were the friends of Ninon de Lenclos, now old and subdued but still vivacious. There was the "Court of Sceaux," where the dwarfish duchesse du Maine, granddaughter of the great Condé, maintained a rival spend-thrift court to further the prospects of her husband, son of Louis XIV and Mme de Montespan, and to oppose the Orléans regent. The duchesse du Maine's desire to have brilliant people about her made her tend to a neo-Preciosity, and her group at Sceaux became a kind of Hôtel de Rambouillet, where under Malézieu and the abbé Genest the *divertissements* remind one of the amusements presided over by Voiture seasoned with Cartesianism and astronomy. Mme de Staal-Delaunay was for many years in the service of the duchesse du Maine, and wrote memoirs.

At the salon of Mme de Tencin intrigue was mixed with philosophy. She was a renegade nun, mistress of the regent, friend of Matthew Prior, Bolingbroke and d'Argenson, and mother, by a *liaison* with the chevalier Destouches, of d'Alembert, whom she heartlessly abandoned. She was the author of some novels, especially the *Mémoires du comte de Comminges*. Her neighbor the *bourgeoise* Mme Geoffrin succeeded in gathering Mme de Tencin's social inheritance, and at her home in the rue Saint-Honoré she made herself one of the important women of France. Fontenelle was her guide, Marmontel her factotum and the abbé Galiani a permanent "meuble" in her drawing-room. Her house became such a cosmopolitan centre, which strangers to Paris delighted to visit, that she afterwards went in triumph to see the king of Poland, once her *protégé* and pupil in society. Horace Walpole at first admired her until he went over to her chief rival, Mme du Deffand. Yet, in spite of all

this vogue, Mme Geoffrin remained rather commonplace in her temperament and manner, and her language kept a plebeian frankness: "Ma tête me pète et mon cœur brûle," she said to express her excitement. Her temper was not good, she squabbled with her husband and her daughter, Mme de la Ferté-Imbault, who objected to her mother's friendship for the Encyclopedists and tried to have a more orthodox establishment of her own.

The marquise du Deffand, the lady of distinction who saw in Mme Geoffrin only a "caillette," as Mme Geoffrin saw in her a "méchante bête," was one of the wittiest and bitterest women of her time. After the usual career of *galanterie* and intrigue she became an intellectual leader, though blind at fifty, in her home in the rue Saint-Dominique, where her friend and counsellor was the président Hénault, a discreet and polished person, a lady's man and writer of memoirs. Mme du Deffand kept up a voluminous correspondence with great men, especially with Voltaire and Horace Walpole, the latter of whom she rather worried by her sentiment and emotionality.

The greatest shock to Mme du Deffand's pride was when her *protégée*, now supposed to be her niece, Julie de Lespinasse, the natural daughter of Mme d'Ablon, was found to be receiving in Mme du Deffand's own house before she was ready for the evening, and was fast becoming a favorite. Banished from the house, Mlle de Lespinasse soon had her own set among the philosophers, chief of whom was d'Alembert, with whom she lived for the rest of her life.

It is not simply as the leader of a *salon* that Mlle de Lespinasse is famous. She is one of the great examples of eighteenth-century *sensiblerie* and emotionality, such as we connect with the names of Richardson and Rousseau. She was temperamentally neurotic, a *cérébrale* and *névrosée*, suffering convulsions and dosing herself with opium. Though d'Alembert was ready to sacrifice all for her, she had two love-storms under his eyes of which he remained in ignorance through her life and of which her letters are the monument. When nearly thirty-six

she conceived a violent passion for a consumptive young Spaniard, the marquis de Mora, twelve years younger than she was, and for the comte de Guibert, a fascinating but not particularly clever man. Of these heart-tempests the record appears in the letters of Mlle de Lespinasse, which are a strange mixture of emotional *abandon* and of self-consciousness.

Letter-writing was, indeed, the passion of the age: Horace Walpole tells of the couple in Paris, who, living together, wrote letters to each other and threw them over a screen put across the middle of the room. One of the most interesting writers from the romantic standpoint, though she died (1733) the year after Mlle de Lespinasse was born, was Mlle Aïssé. She was a young Circassian slave, her name being perhaps a corruption of Haidee, bought as a child of about four in Constantinople by the French ambassador to Turkey M. de Ferriol. He brought her to France and entrusted her education to his sister-in-law Mme de Ferriol, a sister of Mme de Tencin and scarcely the best of chaperons. M. de Ferriol had intended her for himself, but after his death she fell in love with the young chevalier d'Aydie, himself a dashing and romantic character on whom Voltaire based the sire de Couci of his *Adélaïde du Guesclin*. Later she broke the *liaison* and gave herself to piety, but her letters are documents for the understanding of an emotional nature in an age of growing sentiment.

Cleverness was not to be found in the women's *salons* alone. Helvétius, whose widow Franklin wanted to marry, had his circle; the baron d'Holbach, the "maître d'hôtel of philosophy," kept open house for the clan of religion haters and welcomed all innovators. Chief among the wits was the abbé, later cardinal de Bernis, diplomat, statesman and poet, favorite of Mme de Pompadour, whose flowery verses, such as the *Quatre saisons*, caused Voltaire to dub him "Babet la bouquetière," from a fair and florid flower woman of the day. There was also to be seen the abbé Galiani, the Neapolitan dwarf. He came to France as secretary of embassy, and for years was the life of the drawing-

rooms by his southern animation, which made the Teutonic Grimm call him "Harlequin-Plato," as Marmontel called him "Harlequin-Machiavelli." He was a better talker than writer, but he dabbled in all forms of intellectual expression: his sportful treatise, *Dialogues sur le commerce des blés*, made all women discuss economics. After leaving Paris in 1769 he began his correspondence, chiefly with Mme d'Epinay. Even in his native Naples he felt in exile, but his writings remained full of French wit and Italian animation.

But one of the greatest *salons* in the eighteenth century was again that of a woman, Mme Necker. Daughter of a poor Swiss pastor named Curchod and courted in youth by Edward Gibbon, she was the wife of the banker and minister Necker and mother of Mme de Staël. She was a social climber and worked to establish herself in Paris, to which end her husband's position contributed.

Thus it may be seen that in numerous conversational centres and in no less numerous memoirs and letters we have every chance to know the intellectual attitude and the gossip of the eighteenth century. Nor was this all: The *nouvellistes*, newsgatherers and ancestors of our journalists or reporters, gathered together indiscriminately fact and gossip for their "nouvelles à la main." At the home of Mme Doublet de Breuillepont or de Persan the *habitués* of "la Paroisse" devoted themselves systematically to the collection of small talk, which Louis Petit de Bachaumont edited first, and afterwards Pidansat de Mairobert and Moufle d'Angerville, which is known as the *Mémoires secrets de la République des lettres* or *Journal de Bachaumont*, extending from 1762 to 1787. The *Correspondance secrète* known under the name of Métra is also one of the chief sources of information about the gossip of the time.

Though the most brilliant and noisy talkers of the eighteenth century belonged as a rule to the set of philosophers and Encyclopedists, these did not have it all their own way. Their enemies included the most important journalists of the time, capable of

driving Voltaire himself frantic. Chief among them were the abbé Desfontaines and Fréron.

The quarrels of Desfontaines and his imprisonments occupy a prominent place between 1725 and 1745. He was pre-eminently the polemical critic. After having contributed to the *Journal des savants*, he founded in 1730 with the abbé Granet the *Nouvelliste du Parnasse*, like most of the journals of the time in the form of letters. This being stopped, he started the *Observations sur les écrits modernes* (1735–1743), in which he fought Voltaire with irony and malice. This being also suppressed, he began the *Jugements sur quelques ouvrages nouveaux*, which he continued until his death in 1745.

Fréron began his training with Desfontaines. His journalistic publications were the *Lettres de madame la comtesse de . . .* (1745), the *Lettres sur quelques écrits de ce temps* (1749) and the *Année littéraire* (1754). For twenty-five years Fréron attacked the anti-religious party in all its manifestations, literary as well as philosophical. Voltaire, so eager otherwise to maintain the liberty of speech, loathed Fréron:

> Un jour, au fond d'un vallon,
> Un serpent mordit Jean Fréron.
> Que pensez-vous qu'il arriva?
> Ce fut le serpent qui creva.

CHAPTER IV

TRAGEDY

IN the eighteenth century there is little novelty in tragedy, and such as there is, is not in the direction of real strength, though the drama seems popular as never before. Even private individuals of influence had their amateur stages for the performances of theatricals, and they and their friends participated in these. Mme du Maine had her theatre at Sceaux, Voltaire had his with Mme du Châtelet at Cirey or with his fat niece Mme Denis at Paris, Marie-Antoinette used to have performances at the Little Trianon. Among the professional authors some tried to continue the tradition of absolute regularity, and twisted their material to suit the unities. Others, including Voltaire, often weighed their plays down with undramatic material and made them polemical works in favor of a doctrine rather than good acting tragedies. The drama became an interpreter of philosophy in the sense, not of metaphysical reflection, but of theorising on the defects of society and on their remedies. Or, as Voltaire and Crébillon both did, the writers developed the melodramatic and claptrap element. Crébillon tried to terrify by the horrors he portrayed, and Voltaire became almost "Romantic" in the nineteenth-century sense in his effort to startle.

Prosper Jolyot, known under the name of Crébillon (1674–1762), represents the decadence of the drama after Racine's psychological plays, in which the external action had been so reduced to an internal one as to cause a reaction in the other direction. Plays were written in the style of the secondary dramatists like Thomas Corneille, a kind of melodrama full of

the devices of the old seventeenth-century romancers such as La Calprenède. The essential element was the situation, which was made as extraordinary and unusual as possible, a substitution or a case of mistaken identity. Or, as in *Atrée et Thyeste*, he tried to horrify by the picture of implacable family hatreds.

Crébillon wrote nine or ten tragedies, of which the most famous is *Rhadamiste et Zénobie*. He was for many years dramatic censor. Apart from that his friends did him the unkind turn of trying to oppose him to Voltaire, whose dislike he naturally incurred.

Houdar de la Motte was forty-eight when he gave his first tragedy, *les Machabées*, in 1721, after long and mature reflection on the theory of the play, but the only one deserving mention is *Inès de Castro* (1723). In spite of somewhat revolutionary theories, his plays are insipidly Classical, flat in prosody and expression, with abstractions for characters. Yet Houdar de la Motte thought himself a bold innovator in his subject of *Inès* drawn from Portugal and portraying conjugal love, in his minor novelties, such as many characters instead of the conventionally small number, and in his efforts to make the confidants more important and to diminish the monologues.

Voltaire, prolific in everything, was an abundant writer of plays, amounting in number to over fifty, of which more than half were so-called "tragedies." The quotation marks are used advisedly, for the tragedy of Voltaire had already deviated from what it was in the seventeenth century and the strict prescriptions of the rules. Voltaire's ideal of dramatic art is still Racine at his best, as in *Athalie* or *Iphigénie*, and he criticises Corneille from the standpoint of one to whom the canons of the abbé d'Aubignac are the test of art. In theory he does not for a moment favor innovations.

None the less, in practice Voltaire diverges widely from these ideal standards and makes the drama take a decided step beyond the seventeenth-century types. Voltaire was not a poet

and could not rely on beauty of versification to carry his plays through. Scarcely a line in any one of them impresses the reader as noble poetry, and to one already acquainted with the literature of the preceding century the plays of Voltaire seem a patchwork crazy-quilt of quotations or tags of verse. They impress only by an occasional pungent aphorism or rhetorical tirade, and to the spectator of Voltaire's own day they had the additional interest of actuality, as in political pamphlets, because of the references which could be traced behind the actor's words.

Thus deprived of the quality which contributes so much to the literary value of a play, Voltaire fell back on the presentation of action, and in this his dramas are noteworthy. He had the art of thrilling the spectator by sudden climaxes, by the unexpected advent of the appropriate character, by the shocks to the sensibilities which excite the onlooker and do not give him time to reflect on the improbability of the various coincidences. In brief, Voltaire was gifted by nature and by actual experience as actor and amateur manager with the knack of dramatic perception, which he often carried to genuine melodrama. In the best plays the plot speeds on with a vigor of action which Voltaire had in mind when he told Mlle Dumesnil that she must have "le diable au corps."

In his presentation Voltaire was often, like Corneille, burdened by the unities, and we find him throwing them overboard. In many plays the scene is left undetermined and vague, in others, like *Brutus*, *la Mort de César*, the scene changes, and in *Sémiramis* it even does so in the middle of an act. Or by the throwing open of a door or similar device a new scene comes forward to the spectator (*Mérope*, *Mahomet*). The unity of time when technically observed is often violated by the impossibility of conceiving so many events as occurring within twenty-four hours. Of this *Rome sauvée* is an example, containing as it does conspiracies, meetings of the senate, the defeat and death of Catiline. Corneille's activity in *le Cid* is thus equalled or outdone.

In another respect Voltaire departs from the simplicity of the old tragedy. Racine had neglected the ancient world only for far-away Turkey: Voltaire takes his plots at will from all ages and from all lands, the legend of Thebes, the history of Rome, the Crusades, China, the New World, all is grist to his mill. And with an admixture of philosophical tirades or contemporary allusions Voltaire must have appeared a bold innovator in many ways. Some of his actors made slight attempts at modernisation: Le Kain appeared with bare arms and Mlle Clairon without hoops and stuck her arms on her hips. Meanwhile the noblemen had been banished from the stage. So, though it would be going far astray to call Voltaire an ancestor of the Romanticists, yet as a writer of melodrama full of action and contrasts there is a likeness between his plays and theirs. Marked differences are the rich versification of the later school contrasted with the insipid imitation of seventeenth-century style in which Voltaire expressed himself, and the consistency with which Voltaire tries to maintain the distinction of *genres*, in so far that tragedy and comedy shall be kept separate and not united by the conjunction of solemn and grotesque in which Victor Hugo delighted.

Much of the spirit of innovation in Voltaire is to be traced to an influence as strong upon him as that of Spain upon Corneille, namely England and the plays of Shakspere. Theoretically, Voltaire admired the regularity of such a drama as Addison's *Cato*, with its strict observance of the rules, its rejection of comic elements, the dignity and noble rank of its characters. Practically, Voltaire was permeated not only with the philosophy of Locke and Shaftesbury and the science of Newton, but, much more than he was willing to confess, with the art of Shakspere. In the beginning he was proud of being the first to make the English poet known to the French, and boasted of the effect produced on him by the speeches of Brutus and Antony in *Julius Cæsar*, or the terror inspired by the ghost of Hamlet's father, and acknowledged that to the English theatre he owed the thought

of putting on the stage the royal and princely names of France. Gradually, however, he seemed to regret what he had done to advance the cause of Shakspere in France. Partly, perhaps, to conceal the true source of some of his own borrowings, he turned violently against the English dramatist, whom he characterised as a buffoon and a merry-andrew, and began to ridicule the plays, even distorting their contents in his hostile criticisms. Yet it remains true that Voltaire drew from *Hamlet* the idea of the ghost in *Eriphyle*, though he tried to palm it off on the shade of Darius in the *Persae* of Æschylus, and in *Sémiramis;* from *Julius Cæsar* parts of *la Mort de César;* from the death of Gloucester in *King Lear* that of Lusignan in *Zaïre;* from *Macbeth* parts of *Mahomet;* from *Othello* the main idea of *Zaïre.*

The first dramatic success of Voltaire was his *Œdipe* (1718). In this play the author, who is afterwards led to attack the emphasis given to sentiment in tragedy and to try experiments in tragedy without love, gives an insipid lover to the Theban queen Jocasta in a former suitor Philoctetes, and the two discourse as an anæmic Pauline and Sévère of *Polyeucte.* The true importance of the drama lies in its maxims and philosophical tirades:

> Nos prêtres ne sont pas ce qu'un vain peuple pense,
> Notre crédulité fait toute leur science.

Perhaps Voltaire and his friends, lacking historical perspective, and seeing immoral and atheistical priests like cardinal Dubois in their own day, were not so much to be blamed for supposing that the misfortunes of civilisation in all ages had come from a corrupt and intriguing clergy.

Œdipe and two other less successful plays, *Artémire* (1720) and *Mariamne* (1724), still belong to the old tradition. The English influences show themselves with the next four: *Brutus* (1730), a new form of the *motif* treated in Corneille's *Horace,* duty to country above love of kin; *la Mort de César* (1731), in three acts and without women, a concentration of Shakspere's

play into a psychological crisis linked with Cæsar's death; *Eriphyle* (1732) and *Zaïre* (1732).

In *Zaïre*, which remains one of the great plays of Voltaire, the jealousy of a new Othello is somewhat subordinated, after the style of French tragedy, to the crisis of love and duty in the heart of the heroine. In the days of the Crusades, the sultan Orosmane loves Zaïre, one of his captives, who returns his love. On discovering, however, that she is by birth a Christian and daughter of the captive prince Lusignan, she sacrifices love to religion. Orosmane, ignorant of the true cause and jealous of her behavior to her newly found brother Nérestan, kills her and then, on finding his mistake, kills himself.

Alzire (1736) takes the spectator to Peru, amid exotic scenes and romantic imbroglios; *Mahomet* (1742), a drama of superstition and fanaticism, has enriched the French vocabulary with the name *séide*, taken from one of its characters, in the sense of a fanatical partisan like a Mormon Danite. Into this play Voltaire introduced militant warfare against those forms of *l'Infâme* which he was trying to crush.

Mérope (1743) was one of Voltaire's greatest victories. The subject is his favorite one, a parent or child in danger of death by the hand of the other, as in *Œdipe*, *Eriphyle*, *Brutus*, *la Mort de César*, *Mahomet*, *Sémiramis*, *Oreste*. Moreover, it enabled him to develop his desire for romantic drama without the romantic love so much overdone by the degenerate successors of Racine. The subject has been a favorite one with modern writers from Voltaire's model Maffei to Alfieri and Matthew Arnold. Voltaire shows a mother wishing to avenge a son whom she thinks murdered, and about to kill that son himself whom she takes for the murderer.

Sémiramis (1749), a new version of *Eriphyle*, is a combination of the tragic relationship of Orestes and Clytemnestra in Æschylus and of Hamlet and his mother in Shakspere. The latter's play is the true source for Voltaire, for here the ghost of the father appears to prevent an incestuous marriage between Semiramis

guilty of her husband's death and her son, who is finally the agent of the justice which kills her for her crimes. Voltaire's ghost, however, appearing in full daylight in bright array amid hosts of people, was indeed a sorry parody of the mysterious spirit of the night who showed himself to the lonely watchers on the terrace at Elsinore, and Lessing and Schlegel, in their works on the drama, wax merry at the expense of Voltaire's spectre.

Of the numerous remaining plays by Voltaire, *l'Orphelin de la Chine* (1755), has the interest of its pseudo-Oriental environment; another, *Tancrède* (1760), was by its novelty one of the greatest successes of the author. In a new metre of *vers croisés* was presented a drama of French chivalry permeated with the spirit of knighthood and romance. The other compositions, though often acted, were merely contributions to Voltaire's political and philosophical contests. His latest ones, *Irène* and *Agathocle*, the former the last one given in his lifetime, were temporary triumphs because of the author's age and position, but had no permanent merit.

An excellent description of tragedy, as it had become under the influence of Voltaire, is to be found in a satire by the poet Gilbert:

> La Muse de Sophocle, en robe doctorale,
> Sur des tréteaux sanglants professe la morale.
> Là, souvent un sauvage, orateur apprêté,
> Aussi bien qu'Arouet, parle d'humanité;
> Là, des Turcs amoureux, soupirant des maximes,
> Débitent galamment Sénèque mis en rimes;
> Alzire au désespoir, mais pleine de raison,
> En invoquant la mort, commente le *Phédon;*
> Pour expirer en forme, un roi, par bienséance,
> Doit exhaler son âme avec une sentence;
> Et chaque personnage au théâtre produit,
> Héros toujours soufflé par l'auteur qui le suit,
> Fût-il Scythe ou Chinois, dans un traité sans titre,
> Interroge par signe, ou répond par chapitre.

The chief tragedies, apart from those of Voltaire, were *Denys*

le tyran and *Aristomène* by Marmontel, and *Iphigénie en Tauride* by Guimond de la Touche. Jean-François de la Harpe (1739-1803), wrote a series of purely regular and academic tragedies, mostly failures except *Warwick*, *Gustave Wasa* and *Philoctète*. He deserves far higher rank as a critic and lecturer during twelve years at the Lycée upon literature and dramatic art, the basis of his published *Cours de littérature*. De Belloy's *Siège de Calais* won its success because it was a patriotic play coming at an opportune time after the Seven Years' War. In many of the late eighteenth-century tragedies there is little except the form to distinguish them from the contemporary *drame* spoken of in the next chapter.

Jean-François Ducis (1733–1816), himself a sentimentalist and ignorant of English, made the strange attempt, when the devitalised Classical tragedy still held sway and the world was steeped in sentiment, to turn Shakspere into French. He had to use the translations of La Place and Le Tourneur, and transformed the plots and sometimes even the names of characters in those plays which he adapted. Ducis was imbued with moralising and was the friend of Thomas, the rhetorician and eulogist of virtue and of virtuous men. Consequently, the Shaksperean rôles become characters to point a moral or illustrate a virtue: Hamlet is changed into a model of filial piety, and, like a second Cid, avenges his father's death upon Claudius, here the father of Ophelia, the woman he loves. The different persons utter moral platitudes in sounding alexandrines and elaborate periphrasis to their confidants and confidantes, or tell their stories in narrative instead of by action.

But, emasculated as these plays were, they sometimes seemed too daring for the audiences of the time. Not only Voltaire had got over his infatuation for the English "clown" or Gilles Shakspere and fiercely inveighed against Ducis, but some people balked at the ending of *Othello*, and he provided the play with an alternative happy conclusion; he was himself timid about the propriety of bringing upon the stage a crazy king like

Lear, and hesitated before portraying wild scenes with precipices and storms.

Ducis's Shaksperean plays were *Hamlet*, *Roméo et Juliette*, *Léar*, *Macbeth*, *Jean sans Terre* and *Othello*. One of his original plays, *Abufar*, has some foreshadowings of Romantic melancholy. The success of Ducis shows that French theatre-goers were ready for a change, and that the Romantic drama was impending. The innovations of Ducis, mild as they seem today, were in their time marked ones.

CHAPTER V

MISCELLANEOUS DRAMATIC FORMS: REGULAR COMEDY, THE COMEDY OF THE ITALIANS, THE TEARFUL COMEDY AND DRAME BOURGEOIS; THE THÉATRE DE LA FOIRE; OPERA

IN the seventeenth century the theatrical *genres* had been reduced to two, tragedy and comedy, or three if we include opera. In the eighteenth century they again became more numerous. Everybody tried to write comedies, often for private acting, and the vogue for society trifles of this kind was as great as the mania for portraits in the seventeenth century. In addition to the Classical comedy of plot or character there came about the *comédie larmoyante* and the *drame bourgeois*. Finally there arose a hybrid form of song and dialogue, partly of popular origin because of its imitation of the Italian light comedy and its starting-place at the big Parisian fairs. It had to struggle against the musical monopoly of the opera. But gradually the *comédie-vaudeville* or *vaudeville* acquired a standing of its own and developed into the *opéra-comique*.

As Racine marked the climax of seventeenth-century tragedy, so Molière's competitors were dwarfs beside him and he seemed to leave no heir at his death. But the condition was not quite so bad as in tragedy, and in mere numbers the writers were plentiful. The comedies of Thomas Corneille were enjoyed. Then there were Molière's immediate rivals as actors or writers for the rival Hôtel de Bourgogne. There was Montfleury the younger, son of the famous fat tragedian and instigator of fierce slander against Molière; there was Boursault, no less hostile to Molière and the victim of his satire in the *Impromptu de Versailles;* there was Hauteroche, whose *Crispin médecin*, a farce upon doctors, is one of the few plays still worth mentioning;

there were the actor-writers Villiers and Rosimond, and particularly Molière's young protégé, the famous and conceited Baron, whose *Homme à bonnes fortunes*, a don Juan character, is also above the average. There were Chappuzeau, Poisson, and Gilbert; and Quinault wrote some comedies also. On the whole the contemporaries of Molière treat comedy rather in the style of Corneille's earlier writings, either as plays of complicated intrigue or as society gallantries, without real insight into character.

After Molière's death, indeed, there was a slight lull, and then at the dividing line between the two centuries and in the early eighteenth we meet with two noteworthy authors, Regnard and Dancourt, not to speak of the masterpiece of the novelist Lesage, *Turcaret*.

Jean-François Regnard (1655–1709) had an adventurous life which led him all over Europe from Italy to Lapland, and for a time he was a prisoner of the Barbary corsairs. Afterward he settled definitely in Paris and devoted himself chiefly to the writing of comedies. He was a man of superabundant vitality, and his plays, though insignificant as character studies or portraits of types, are full of animation. None the less Regnard's titles indicate characters. The laughter aroused is sometimes the result of forced situations, as in *le Distrait*, or of horse-play, as in *les Folies amoureuses*.

Regnard began by comedies for the Italian actors, prose farces. His first important play, *le Joueur*, is a satire of the passion for gambling which reigned in all circles. But the author is not so much occupied with the moral as with the humor of the situations, as he portrays the dissipated young gambler who sacrifices even his mistress to his passion. *Le Distrait* is again an amusing but overdrawn picture of a man so absentminded that he forgets what he is doing, asks for articles that he is wearing, and talks to the wrong person so obtusely that it is impossible to make him listen to reason. *Démocrite* is an unsuccessful attempt to portray the misanthrope who by

his laughter scorns the follies of mankind. *Les Folies amoureuses*, one of the best, is full of the wild tricks of the frisky young heroine Agathe who deceives her doting old guardian by her mad disguises and still madder yarns. The *Ménechmes* is a revival of that comedy of Plautus from which the *Comedy of Errors* is drawn. In the Latin comedy, however, the two brothers are unaware of the similarity of name and appearance; in Regnard's play one of them is the unscrupulous adventurer who takes advantage of the likeness to deceive his rustic brother. The *Légataire universel* is the last, and in many respects the best, of Regnard's writings and shows the efforts of a crowd of dishonest people to get the inheritance of an old man.

Regnard is often ranked second only to Molière among the comic authors of France. Though his plays may have seemed in their day wildly comic, they are far beneath Molière's as types. Regnard is at his best in portraying the harum-scarum reprobates of Italian tradition, whom he makes at least somewhat more sympathetic by his exuberant animation.

Dufresny was responsible for the original idea of Regnard's *Joueur*, but his own *Chevalier joueur* is far inferior. His *Esprit de contradiction* and *Coquette de village*, the latter with its representation of peasant dialect, are still fairly amusing.

Dancourt (1661–1725) is an example of the "smart" playwright. His comedies, such as *la Foire Saint-Germain*, *les Bourgeois de qualité*, *la Femme d'intrigues*, *le Chevalier à la mode*, are caricatures of passing events and fashions set forth in brisk and witty dialogue, but without the quality of permanence. Dancourt is praised for his success in portraying, not merely single types, as in the comedies before his time, but classes of society.

In Lesage's *Turcaret* (1709) we come to one of the masterpieces of the eighteenth century. It is a play directed against the farmers of revenue, or *traitants*, who were intensely hated at this period for the dishonest ways in which they made fortunes by handling government taxes. It was a period of wild speculation which culminated in the Mississippi scandal of John

Law. With hints from Molière's *Comtesse d'Escarbagnas* and *Bourgeois gentilhomme*, he portrayed the duping of the dishonest financier by people even more unscrupulous than himself, who play upon his vanity and amorous weakness:

> Recevez ce billet, charmante Phillis,
> Et soyez assurée que mon âme
> Conservera toujours une éternelle flamme,
> Comme il est certain que trois et trois font six.

As Turcaret sinks, the tricky valet Frontin rises in the world, the embodiment of independence and irreverence on the part of the third, or even of a fourth estate. "Voilà le règne de monsieur Turcaret fini, le mien va commencer."

We have heard a great deal of the presence of Italian actors in France ever since the sixteenth century, and how they finally established themselves definitely in Paris. The comedies, which grew into a combination of written plot and improvisation, were at first given in Italian. As time passed and the knowledge of Italian diminished in France coincidently with the change to Spanish influences at court and in literature, the actors gradually introduced a French element into their plays, the proportion of which increased until the Italians were serious rivals of the French actors. Finally, Frenchmen took to writing plays for the Italians, among them Regnard, Dufresny, and Nolant de Fatouville, a bitter satirist.

The characters, a dozen in number, bore stock and traditional names: Isabelle, Marinette, Octave, Cinthio, Scaramouche, Arlequin, Mezzetin, Pascariel, Pantalon, le Docteur. The plays, which were apt to be extremely coarse, were farcical and satirical, sometimes parodies of French tragedies, full of travesties and horse-play. Or again, they gave comedies of manners, portrayals of contemporary characters with their weaknesses and vices.

The violent personal satire of the Italians made opposition against them bitter. At last, in 1697, their theatre was closed

and they were dismissed from the capital: they had been too free with Mme de Maintenon. Under the regency after the death of Louis XIV they were readmitted, and in 1716 the troop of Luigi Riccoboni or Lélio began to perform in Paris, containing among its members the talented actress Gianetta Benozzi or Silvia. They first tried to give Italian plays, but as these did not take, they gradually turned again to French, keeping in their new comedies the traditional Italian names, Lélio, Silvia, Mario, Arlequin, and so forth. Jacques Autreau was their first collaborator, but the greatest was Marivaux, whose famous comedies were composed for the Italians and adapted to the art of Silvia.

Pierre Carlet de Chamblain de Marivaux (1688–1763) was a prolific but heedless writer, the author of over thirty plays and half a dozen stories, the chief of which remained unfinished, as well as of a good deal of miscellaneous journalism.

He marks a new stage in comedy and in fiction. His influence in the latter was perhaps the more considerable; in the former he shows the greater art. In such plays as the *Jeu de l'amour et du hasard* and *les Fausses confidences* there is little elaboration of plot or complication of intrigue. The world in which the actors move is a realm of fantasy, the characters flit before the imagination without making any definite impression except that of grace and charm. Their whole action centres about the awakening of love, when youth and maiden feel the first touch of sentiment before strong passion has come. The comedies of Marivaux are romantic, but widely remote from the atmosphere of violent emotion which in the following century characterised technical Romanticism. Marivaux had a good deal of feminine sensitiveness, which indeed seems to have shown itself in his emotional susceptibility and timid disposition. To this was added a subtle psychological feeling enabling him to analyse the hearts of young lovers and to develop a new style and language for the expression of these experiences. Therefore, Marivaux gives to the heart the chief place in his plays, and he is

the eighteenth-century counterpart of Racine in comedy. He is the inventor of what is known as *marivaudage*, a sort of metaphysics of the heart told in a language so individual that jesters said the place for Marivaux was not in the Académie française, but in the Academy of Sciences, as the maker of a new language. The style of Marivaux shows preciosity of thought and euphuism of language, though not carried to the extent of neologisms or of invented phrases. All his characters, servants as well as mistresses, possess the power of ringing the changes upon their sensibilities, of trifling with pretty metaphors, of turning their feeling into bubbles of wit and airy nothings. In so doing Marivaux was to a certain degree following the traditions of the Italians for whom he wrote, but even those specifically composed for French players show us dainty soubrettes like Lisette, the witty valets Arlequin and Dubois, no less than graceful ladies such as Silvia.

The name which it is customary to couple with Marivaux is Watteau, whose graceful figures move in a world as unreal as that of Marivaux, and his *Embarquement pour Cythère* is often referred to as an apotheosis of the spirit of Marivaux. The society in which they lived was the same, corrupt at heart, but wearing an external air of grace and leisurely refinement. It is often possible to read a perverted thought in Marivaux's speeches, but no actually unbecoming phrase is used.

The *Jeu de l'amour et du hasard* is a good example of Marivaux's ever recurring treatment of the surprises and disguises of love. Silvia and Dorante are destined to marry, but each one, wishing to know what the other is like, assumes the disguise of soubrette and valet respectively, not knowing that the other has thought of the same device, while Arlequin and Lisette masquerade as master and mistress. So Araminte and Dorante of *les Fausses confidences* are drawn together. Angélique in *l'Ecole des mères* is Marivaux's *ingénue*, somewhat like Molière's Agnès of *l'Ecole des femmes* whom the author has in mind, but not so *niaise*.

Other characteristic plays by Marivaux are *la Surprise de l'amour*, *le Legs*, *l'Epreuve*, and a fairy comedy, *Arlequin poli par l'amour*.

In the eighteenth century there grew up a dramatic form standing between tragedy and comedy and uniting the moderate social ranks of comedy with the serious problems of tragedy. This was called the *comédie larmoyante* and later the *drame bourgeois*. Tragedy itself had been carried off to a world of stage conventions, so that the modernity of Racine had disappeared. On the other hand, with many authors comedy was tending to diverge from Molière's traditions and to assume the form of emotional sentimentalism and moralisation in action. This is what Destouches was doing in plays such as the *Philosophe marié*, or even *le Glorieux*. The reaction went farther when people tired of the portraits of scoundrels in Regnard and Dancourt and began to think that man is by nature good and that, if he has deviated from virtue, he can be restored to righteousness by playing upon his instincts and touching his emotions. It was Nivelle de la Chaussée who first deliberately constructed plays on this principle, unless we consider Destouches to have anticipated him. Voltaire, too, wrote tearful comedies: *l'Enfant prodigue* and *Nanine*, but tried to differentiate them from the simple *comédie larmoyante*, as a "mixed type" containing humor and pathos together.

Pierre-Claude Nivelle de la Chaussée (1691 or 2–1754) did not take up literature until he was forty. He did some miscellaneous work, even in the drama, including a poor tragedy, besides coarse *contes* in verse and his *comédies larmoyantes*. It is entirely on these last that his reputation rests, and even they are not remembered individually today.

La Chaussée hit upon the notion that many experiences of everyday life afford undeveloped dramatic possibilities. The chief element was pathos: anything contributed which brought out emotional crises, such as the perversion of natural affection by jealousy, misunderstanding, or the impediment of unsym-

pathetic and rigid laws. He made the mistake, according to the modern view, of undue complication of plot. The portrayal of character fell into the background, and the people of his plays have absolutely no individuality by which they can be remembered: men are either good or bad, the virtuous one or the villain. Whatever psychology is to be found in La Chaussée depends on the quality of the emotions and the feeling that nature is good, that love is a sign of virtue, that the *cœur sensible* overcomes all obstacles, that lack of restraint is a symptom of the force of a good man. All this, as M. Lanson the biographer of La Chaussée points out, brings him into relation with Rousseau. The great merit of La Chaussée is his skill in the planning of climaxes. But the names of individual plays such as *la Fausse antipathie*, *le Préjugé à la mode*, *Mélanide*, or *Paméla* do not mean much to the general reader.

Diderot's connection with the theatre was both theoretical and practical, and the beginning of the *drame bourgeois* is dated from the publication of *le Fils naturel* in 1757. His theory, set forth particularly in the *Entretiens avec Dorval* and the *Discours sur la poésie dramatique*, was that the theatre is too remote from life as a result of excessive conventions; that the various "conditions" of life, such as the father, judge, or physician, are as significant as the portrayal of actual character (though this tended to the creation of artificial types); that poetry may give way to prose in the interest of naturalness; that the drama should reproduce the pantomime of the actor. Diderot conceives new *genres* which shall be neither the old tragedy nor the new comedy, but which shall stand as a portrayal of tragic emotions in ordinary life instead of among heroes. His idea is of a *tragédie domestique et bourgeoise* and *comédie sérieuse*. In the *Paradoxe sur le comédien* he argues that the actor's part should be intellectual rather than emotional. Diderot's actual plays, *le Fils naturel* and *le Père de famille*, as well as the comedy *Est-il bon, est-il méchant?* were unsatisfactory productions, but his innovations were big with consequences.

The *drame* is differentiated from the *comédie larmoyante*, from which people do not always distinguish it, by its more distinctly middle-class characters and its social purport.[1] It was a vehicle for the moral instruction and edification of the *bourgeoisie* and for the presentation of its virtues as opposed to the vices of the nobility and the privileged classes. In other words, the importance of the drama coincided with the rise of the ranks which were to gain power at the Revolution and it was often a means of philosophical propagandism. Authors used it for the expression of their theories on all subjects, political, religious, and social. Especially it underwent the influence of contemporary sensibility and developed a lachrymose morality resting on the current misconception of psychology, by which man is supposed to be in his true nature virtuous and beneficent. Hence it came that villains were whitewashed and restored to purity by a sudden repentance, or that the "voice of nature" (*la voix du sang*) was the most potent dramatic device. Love, the emotion which found expression in that "voice," could overcome the greatest obstacles of time or space, so that the sudden recognition or ἀναγνώρισις of the drama, accompanied by the welling-up of a new-found love for long lost kinsfolk, threw into the shade any solution of a comedy of Molière and foretold the melodrama, which is descended from the *drame bourgeois*.

Diderot, the chief initiator of the *drame*, was greatly influenced by England and particularly by such plays as Lillo's *London Merchant* and Moore's *Gamester*. These plays portrayed middle class life, but their tone of crude realism had to be toned down in French counterparts, for those were the days when French *bourgeois* decency, at least in the theatre, looked askance at the coarseness of English literature, precisely inverting the modern attitude.

As a result of their priggish morality and sentiment as well

[1] M. Gaiffe, in *le Drame en France au XVIIIe siècle*, defines it: "Un spectacle destiné à un auditoire bourgeois ou populaire et lui présentant un tableau attendrissant et moral de son propre milieu."

as their now outworn theses the eighteenth-century dramas are for the most part unreadable today. The majority of them, being in prose, have no additional charm of style and the few in verse belong to a prosaic age. The chief prose writers were Diderot, Sedaine, Beaumarchais, and Sébastien Mercier, and the best play, though officially a comedy, is Sedaine's *le Philosophe sans le savoir*.

At the end of the seventeenth century, when the Italian actors were under the ban, the theatrical shows at the fairs of Saint-Germain in winter and of Saint-Laurent in summer reaped part of the benefit. The actors in the booths, to a certain degree acrobats, tried to replace the Italians and even to use their topics. They and the French actors of the official theatre objected and caused obstructive measures to be passed. In 1707 all shows containing dialogues were prohibited. The actors of the fairs had to resort to subterfuges, a monologue supported by the pantomime of silent performers, or successive speeches by persons following one another upon the stage. Finally they devised the scheme of interspersing pantomime with songs written to popular tunes and displayed to the audience on placards from the stage. Thus the audience did the singing. Such was the beginning of the *opéra-comique* or operetta, interspersed with satirical songs or vaudevilles; for soon the songs were restored to the actors on the stage.[1]

Among the numerous authors who contributed to the *théâtre*

[1] The vaudeville, of which so much is heard in French dramatic literature and which Boileau thought important enough to mention in his *Art poétique* in the seventeenth century, was originally a satirical song. The etymology has usually been attributed to a corruption of "Vaux de Vire," songs of the vales of Vire in Normandy. These were satirical drinking songs by the Normans Olivier Basselin and Jean le Houx in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Another derivation is from "Voix de ville." By the eighteenth century a vaudeville is an original song of which the tune has become popular and is applied to other words, or the term is used indiscriminately for the two songs. The verse of the chorus or of the first verse placed at the beginning to indicate the tune was called the *timbre*, and the

de la Foire were Piron, Pannard, Favart, and, above all, Lesage who began to work for it at the age of forty-three. He gave himself to the task with great ardor, sometimes helped by d'Orneval and Fuselier.

The *pièces foraines* of Lesage were brisk plays, often in one act, and could be plot performances or character sketches. The former would bring together Léandre and Isabelle, separated by a misunderstanding, the second would be a series of portraits, a *pièce à tiroirs*. Longer plays might contain romantic adventures interspersed even with magic and fairy devices or allegorical personifications. The characters were usually the traditional ones borrowed from the Italian comedy which the actors at the fairs had tried to annex, Arlequin, Scaramouche, Mezzetin, le Docteur. To these is added Pierrot, a French and more innocent Pulcinella. A large number of the plays of Lesage are devoted to the adventures of Arlequin, who changes character in different plays as his environment varies.

The last outgrowth of this tradition is to be found in the *arlequinades* of Florian at the end of the eighteenth century, intended, however, for the regular theatre. In these plays Harlequin becomes, in spite of his conventional variegated garb, an ordinary mortal, experiencing the troubles of real life and facing its trials in the mood of the *comédie larmoyante* and the *drame bourgeois*. The author makes him run the gamut of sentimental love, of married love, of paternal love, with the anxieties of an innocent and simple man. The plays of Florian, as we shall see his other writings to be, were soft and tender. Vigor is not to be sought in them, but they are among those few productions of minor writers whose archaic grace and languid, though perhaps over-tearful melancholy, can attract a different age.

tune was called the *fredon* (Font, *Essai sur Favart*). Later and down into the nineteenth century a vaudeville was a comedy interspersed with songs of this character. With the greater modern development and differentiation of operetta and comic opera, the songs dropped out of the vaudeville, which is now merely a farce with an improbably complicated plot.

The rise of the comic opera is connected with the name of Charles-Simon Favart (1710–1792) and of his wife Mme Favart. She was one of the most graceful and natural actresses of the century, in spite of the unfavorable opinion of Grimm, and the plays of the husband and the acting of the wife made an indissoluble whole.

Favart began by writing vaudeville plays about 1732. In the early fifties there is a gradual transformation, until by 1762 his plays have become *opéras-comiques*, that is to say comedies in which the vaudevilles were replaced by original songs or melodies called *ariettes*. The best plays of Favart of different kinds, for he did not intentionally keep his species distinct, were: *la Chercheuse d'esprit*, *Acajou*, *Bastien et Bastienne* (a parody of Rousseau's *Devin du village*), *les Ensorcelés*, *Ninon à la cour*, *Annette et Lubin*, *les Trois sultanes*.

The comic operas of Favart are all sentimental plays of village life in which we see the growth of love between rustic couples, Bastien and Bastienne, Jeannot and Jeannette, Colin and Lison, Alain and Nicette. The innocence of the plays was sometimes a very conscious one, and the lines had equivocal meanings for the sophisticated, powdered, patched, and painted *seigneurs* and ladies of the eighteenth century. But it was pretty to see sweet little maidens reclining on the grass, receiving nosegays from sweet little youths or singing songs such as in *Bastien et Bastienne:*

Je r'gard' si mes manches
  Sont blanches,
Si ma collerette
  Est bien faite,
Si j'ai lacé drêt
  Mon corset,
Si mon jupon
  Fait bien le rond,
Et si mes sabots
  Sont biaux.

The regular opera had a plentiful vogue in the eighteenth

century, as the great rivalry between the "Gluckistes" and the "Piccinistes" shows, but its history gradually becomes more interesting to the student of musical history or even of politics than to the student of literature. Michel Sedaine (1719–1797) wrote several operas of which the most famous was *Richard Cœur de Lion* (1785) with music by Grétry and containing Blondel's famous song, "Richard, ô mon roi, l'univers t'abandonne." The interest in the Middle Ages, presaging one of the tendencies of Romanticism, was being aroused by the studies and writings of the comte de Tressan, Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye, and Legrand d'Aussy. The operas of Sedaine were light and airy, and graceful in spite of their superficiality. Marmontel also wrote operas.

Sedaine is better remembered today for his serious comedy, *le Philosophe sans le savoir*, which contained the sentiment of the contemporary drama, in which it might be classed, without its overdone lachrymose tendency. Similarly, Alexis Piron (1689–1773) left only one work of permanent value, the verse comedy *la Métromanie*,[1] on the passion for writing poetry. But in his own day he was the rival and, in the opinion of many people, the equal of Voltaire. His adventurous life was sprinkled with wit and buffoonery, he left behind him a tradition of countless epigrams, and he accomplished a *tour de force* for the *théâtre de la Foire* in the monologue comic opera of *Arlequin-Deucalion*. He wrote also stories in verse and tragedies. The reputation of Jean-Baptiste-Louis Gresset (1709–1777) is based now only on his comedy *le Méchant* and his frolicsome tale in verse of *Ver-Vert*, the parrot piously brought up in a convent of nuns, who learned to swear. But the English poet Gray admired his play *Sidnei*.

[1] The eighteenth century produced a *Musicomanie* by Audinot, a *Mélomanie* by Grenier, and a *Dramomanie* by Cubières.

CHAPTER VI

FICTION

THE fiction of the eighteenth century is a mirror of the manners of that age. The greater writers, it is true, have their originality and creative leadership, so that Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, Lesage, Marivaux, or the abbé Prévost stand by themselves. But in the average writers are found the characteristic libertinism of thought and expression, the fondness for sensual allusions and insinuations, the contempt of woman except as an incitement to lust. At the same time, in many writers this is disguised under a vapid sentimentalism and moralising intended to make the indecency more spicy. There is open indecency in Voltaire, there is veiled indecency in Rousseau, but the type of the licentious and voluptuous writer is the now almost forgotten Crébillon *fils* (1707–1777), whose immoral *Sopha* posed as a "conte moral." It was fashionable to write short stories or feigned correspondences, under pseudonyms or an easily solved anonymity, which were either frankly imaginative, or satirised contemporary manners and institutions. As the century advanced and corruption became more unabashed, successes were won by the novels of Restif de la Bretonne (1734–1806), whose *Paysan perverti* and *Monsieur Nicolas, ou le cœur humain dévoilé* are instances of his numerous works giving a picture of the life of his day and of the writer's mind. Restif had also some of the sarcasm of Voltaire and the aspiration for social reforms of Rousseau, combined with a realism which gives him some value, so that he need not be considered as a licentious writer alone. Similarly Choderlos de Laclos (1741–1803), the author of the *Liaisons dangereuses*, was a brave general who

could make the excuse that his pictures of vice purged the passion through horror, and Louvet de Couvray (1760–1797), who wrote the *Aventures du chevalier de Faublas*, could count to his credit courageous action in politics as a member of the Girondist party. But the marquis de Sade (1740–1814), author of *Justine* and *Juliette*, did nothing better than give his name to a form of erotic madness. Fortunately this chapter can be devoted to other and better writers.

Alain-René Lesage (1668–1747), born in Brittany, passed a very uneventful life. He was a good husband and father, conscientious in his work and making his living by his pen, although he was too proud to curry favor with people of influence. He began his literary career with the *Lettres d'Aristénète*, a translation. With the exception of *Crispin rival de son maître* and the masterpiece *Turcaret* his dramatic contribution went to the *théâtre de la Foire*. His reputation in fiction rests on *le Diable boiteux* (1707) and *Gil Blas*, the publication of which was spaced from 1715 to 1735. The *Aventures du flibustier Beauchêne* is a romance of adventure; *Guzman d'Alfarache*, *Estevanille Gonzalès*, *le Bachelier de Salamanque* belong to the same Spanish tendency as *Gil Blas* and the *Diable boiteux*, and are instances of the interest still felt by the French for Spain since the beginning of the seventeenth century.

The *Diable boiteux*, based originally on a work by Guevara as a starting-point but with an original development, is a satire of contemporary French life masquerading under a Spanish exterior. The devil Asmodée, opening the roofs of the city, shows to Cléophas the life that is going on within.

Gil Blas is the great French example of a picaresque novel, the biography of an adventurer and soldier of fortune. Much ink has been wasted to show that Lesage in this work was plagiarising a Spanish model. It is in reality an absolutely original book. The hero is a youth of lowly origin, brought up by an uncle, a canon. He sets forth to make his way in the world and, after various rises and falls, reaches at last a haven of pros-

perity. The narrative, in the first person, details the misadventures in a naïf way, with as much solemnity as the successes, so that the book is a masterpiece of well-proportioned humor. The style is natural and renders a romance of adventure in a realistic manner. The story belongs to the category of *romans à tiroirs* and the main narrative is often interrupted by the subordinate biographies of secondary characters and by excursions into literary criticism. As foils to the hero stand his friend the decadent and bohemian poet Fabrice, follower of Gongora; the valet Scipion, a compound of audacity and smatterings of erudition; the adventurers Rafaël and Ambroise, who end a career of crime under the ban of the Inquisition. The novel, with its array of pages crammed with incident, strewn with unexpected encounters, gives one a broad survey of all society from royalty down to the ignorant Dr. Sangrado who made as many widows and orphans as the siege of Troy, or to the abodes of thieves and prostitutes. Often, too, under the Spanish names are to be found allusions to French people: Gabriel Triaquero may be Voltaire, and the parallel of Lope de Vega and Calderón stands for one between Corneille and Racine; Alonso de la Ventoleria is the conceited but talented actor Baron, the favorite pupil of Molière. Lesage's hero, a weak and unprincipled youth, but neither better nor worse than the average man of his day, became the prototype, if not the ideal, of many a similar adventurer in France from Marivaux's *Paysan parvenu* to Balzac's Rastignac and Maupassant's Bel-Ami, and in England to the heroes of Smollett and Fielding. He had parallels in real life in adventurers who rose to power such as the cardinal Dubois.

Marivaux began his literary experiments with silly parodies: *Pharsamon, ou les Folies romanesques*, an imitation of Cervantes and a skit of the Scudéry type of novel; travesties of the *Iliad* and of *Télémaque*. But in his long, though unfinished, *Marianne* in eleven parts, he wrote the autobiography of a woman who, at an early age, finds herself unprotected in Paris and a

victim of hypocrites and schemers. M. de Climal trying to win Marianne plays the part of Tartuffe and is the rival of his own nephew Valville, himself unworthy of Marianne. This is the book which is supposed to have impelled Richardson to tell of the rewarded virtue of Pamela, though M. Texte denies the influence of Marivaux on Richardson. In both cases the story is of a wrongly persecuted maiden, though the treatment is different, and the heroines are representative of their two countries. Marianne is a more cultivated woman than Pamela in her middle-class environment. Modest and innocent as she is made out to be, she realises, like many heroines in French fiction, the power of her sex. When obliged to expose her injured foot, she blushes at the necessity, but is not displeased to show her lover how pretty it is: she is a compatriot of the "coquette vertueuse," Andromaque.

The *Paysan parvenu* like *Marianne* is an unfinished story, a sort of autobiographical picaresque novel, telling of the rise of the peasant Jacob de la Vallée. This work was a model for Fielding's *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones*, but his works, though more vigorous than the novel of Marivaux, are coarser and more boisterous in their whole action. However, they show the same psychological analysis of character in addition to borrowing specific incidents from both novels of Marivaux.

The sentimentality and tearfulness of Marivaux are a model for Sterne in his *Tristram Shandy* and more especially in the *Sentimental Journey*, where emotional incident is expatiated upon and revamped *ad nauseam*.

Finally, another connecting-link between Marivaux and England is found in his *Spectateur français*, on the model of Addison's *Spectator*. But this, as well as sundry other journalistic experiments of Marivaux, had more immediate success than permanence. His indolence made him no person to continue an experiment once begun, and his career is scattered with other unfinished tasks besides his two long novels.

The abbé Antoine-François Prévost, Prévost d'Exiles (1697–

1763), did vastly more for literature than for the Church. Interlarding novitiates with the Jesuits and the Benedictines by military service, his volatile and susceptible temperament made him constantly dissatisfied and more fond of writing fiction than of toiling over the *Gallia christiana*, until finally he fled to England. There he became imbued with the spirit of religious and political liberty, deeply interested in the literature, and earned his living by writing and teaching. This love of liberty was not diminished by residence in Holland, where in 1731 appeared the *Histoire du chevalier des Grieux et de Manon Lescaut* before a new and briefer stay in England. Then, returning to France, he lived there almost uninterruptedly for the rest of his life, partly as chaplain of the prince de Conti, chiefly as an independent member of the secular clergy, writing books for a living and viewing religion much more as a deist than as an orthodox clergyman. The story that he was killed by the knife of a surgeon who thought him already dead from apoplexy is without foundation.

The abbé Prévost is one of the first important instances of the professional book manufacturer and Grub-street writer. Though he composed over a hundred volumes at the smallest estimate (it is true that the average size of a volume in those days was small), a single one only, the tale of Manon, has made him famous with posterity. He was a journalist and reviewer in his periodical, *le Pour et le Contre*, treating miscellaneous topics, often English literature; he wrote novels in a moralising strain, such as the *Mémoires d'un homme de qualité*, of which *Manon Lescaut* was originally an episode; in the semi-philosophical mood, like his *Cleveland*, supposed to be the natural son of Cromwell; of Vicar-of-Wakefield sentiment, such as the *Doyen de Killerine;* of love-emotion, like the *Histoire d'une grecque moderne* founded on the story of Mlle Aïssé; or of semi-science, like the *Histoire des voyages*, a collection of narratives of adventure by land and sea.

The importance of Prévost in French literature is twofold: he

made Richardson known and he invented or recreated the novel of sentiment and emotion. Prévost translated not only less popular authors like Hume and Middleton, but also *Pamela*, *Clarissa Harlowe*, and *Sir Charles Grandison*. His versions or adaptations, coming from an already noted man of letters, made Richardson still more popular and undoubtedly were responsible for the cult of Richardson and for the Richardsonesque novel in France in the second half of the eighteenth century.

Prévost's novels generally had sombre plots, steeped in complicated and melodramatic incidents masquerading under a pseudo-realism. But in *Manon Lescaut* there is simple narrative, mingled with passion, of the love of the young chevalier des Grieux for the wayward courtesan Manon, who in spite of her fondness for him is led by her longing for luxury to successive acts of infidelity. By its portrayal of the sufferings love involves and the realism of its narrative (probably based on some experience of Prévost himself), the story has won a place in the first rank. It is often rated among the novels of dubious morality published in modern *éditions de luxe*, but the seeker after the obscene will waste time in reading it. Manon was a *fille de joie* who ruined the life of Des Grieux, but the tale is innocuous compared with what literature produced then or has produced since.

CHAPTER VII

MONTESQUIEU. POLITICAL THEORISTS, HISTORIANS, MORALISTS

THE eighteenth century was an age of political theorising, and its greatest writer on political science was Montesquieu. Charles-Louis de Secondat, born in 1689, was originally called baron de la Brède from the name of his birthplace, near Bordeaux. He was educated by the Oratorians at the Collège de Juilly, became councillor of the Parlement of Bordeaux and, by inheritance from an uncle, baron de Montesquieu and president of the Parlement of Guyenne, a post in which he took but little interest. On the other hand, he was engrossed in many literary and scientific schemes; at first in a somewhat desultory way, much after the fashion of Montaigne, whom Montesqueiu resembled in more than one trait of character, as well as in their southern race.

The *Lettres persanes* were his first work of importance, printed anonymously in 1721 and issued, as were the *Considérations* and the *Esprit des lois*, under the name of publishers of Amsterdam and Cologne, in the latter case with the convenient attribution to the imaginary Pierre Marteau. None the less, the true authorship was known, and Montesquieu won all the fashionable success that such a work of social satire could achieve in the *salons* of Mme de Lambert and Mme de Tencin. It has been suggested that, in connection with a flirtation or affair with Mlle de Clermont, sister of the duc de Bourbon, Montesquieu wrote for her his *Temple de Gnide*, a *péché de jeunesse* in which the antiquity of Hellas was united with the morality or immorality of the *régence*. After one unsuccessful attempt Montesquieu

was elected to the Academy but, offended at his reception, he had little to do with that body and travelled extensively for three years through Europe. He made an important visit to England, where he was introduced by Lord Chesterfield, and his membership in the Royal Society helped him in much of his subsequent work: he always kept up his interest in England and the English. On returning to La Brède he spent there the rest of his life, managing his estates, cultivating his English garden (*not* the sentimental *jardin anglais*), co-ordinating in his books the results of his travels, reading and reflection, and whiling away, there or at Paris, the blindness of his last years. His *Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur et de la décadence des Romains* appeared in 1734, the *Dialogue de Sylla et d'Eucrate* in 1745, the *Esprit des lois* in 1748. His last works were unimportant, except an *Essai sur le goût* destined for the *Encyclopedia*. Some of his minor writings have been exhumed from the family archives only in the present day. Montesquieu died in 1755.

The *Lettres persanes* represent one of the two distinct characters present in Montesquieu. There was in him a satirical and sensual side, as well as sympathy with stoicism. The former found expression in the pretended correspondence of Usbek and of Rica, the philosopher and satirist, who are in turn aspects of Montesquieu's criticism. The *Lettres persanes* were suggested by the *Amusements sérieux et comiques* of Dufresne, and the accounts of travels in the Orient by Tavernier and Chardin, and were placed in a setting which appealed to a lover, like Montesquieu, of the *Thousand and One Nights*, recently translated. They are largely comments on French life and civilisation by a Persian supposed to be travelling in Europe, and having the gift of seeing it as others do. The book was artfully adapted to create a scandal by its frank criticism, which made it "sell like bread" as one of Montesquieu's friends predicted. The author disliked the results of the reign of Louis XIV, its nagging despotism, the resulting hypocrisy. But it

took a good deal of boldness, even under Louis XV, to laugh at a king who "had a minister of eighteen and a mistress of eighty" and preferred "un homme qui le déshabille ou qui lui donne la serviette lorsqu'il se met à table à un autre qui lui prend des villes ou lui gagne des batailles" (Letter XXXVII), or to make fun of those two magicians, the king who, when he needs money, tells his subjects that "un morceau de papier est de l'argent, et ils en sont aussitôt convaincus," and the pope who makes people believe that three are one, that bread is not bread and that wine is not wine (Letter XXIV). Nor was Montesquieu any more sparing in his satire of the people at large, and the famous passage on the curiosity of the Parisians (Letter XXX) is one of a series of jests at the inhabitants of Paris, as *badauds* and *gobeurs*, from Rabelais's *Gargantua* to the present period.

At the same time it is undeniable that many of the letters come from a corrupt mind, or, at any rate, are the product of a perverted age. They are full of veiled allusions and contain too much about eunuchs and similar topics to please a healthy philistinism.

The *Considérations* have been called a detached section of the *Esprit des lois* published beforehand, yet certainly they are an independent work. Montesquieu is one of those who kept alive the popular conception of the Roman in the transmission to the American and the French Revolutions, and he saw in him the general laws of human nature that the Classicists had portrayed in their literature. Many have been the attempts to draw analogies between the *Considérations* and Bossuet's *Discours sur l'Histoire universelle*, but, as M. Barckhausen points out, their agreement is practically only where there can be only one opinion. Yet undeniably the broad sweep of generalisation and the outlook over the ages show much that is similar in the two authors, though one explains by the divine and the other by the human. Montesquieu, however, expresses himself in the choppy language, the brief paragraphs, and with the piece-

meal treatment of the eighteenth century. Among his actual sources or instigators were probably the sixteenth-century historian of Rome Flavio Blondi and the late Roman writer Florus. To this might be added the stoicism of Plutarch, the narrative of the rise of Rome in Polybius, that of its decline in Tacitus. Among the causes by which Montesquieu explains the greatness of Rome were the equality of early citizens and their common share in war, patriotism and the sanctity of the oath, obedience to the laws, even the civil contests which turned every person into a soldier but ceased in the presence of a common foe, toleration of the faiths and customs of conquered peoples. On the other hand, Rome fell by its own size, which magnified civil troubles into wars, by the fighting in distant lands, by the incorporation of so many foreign nations, the corruption of later years, the tyrannical government of vile emperors.

The *Considérations* are one of the best instances in literature of the *specious* explanation of the concrete facts of history. The bias of an author's intellectual preferences, the grouping of his arguments, the method of classifying or of interpreting facts, all give a glow of assurance to what might by a different author be grouped or interpreted in a different way. None the less, Montesquieu's work is a noteworthy example of mature reflection, of judicious reasoning and, it would seem, on the whole of correct inference.

The *Esprit des lois* was Montesquieu's *magnum opus* to which he devoted a score of years of study and to which he sacrificed his eyesight. It was the quintessence of his original thought, "prolem sine matre creatam." Yet it has much of the fine manners and elegant flippancy upon which the eighteenth century prided itself as the climax of literary good taste. Some of the chapters have the inconsequence of chapters in *Tristram Shandy*. But these are only matters of external form, and the *Esprit des lois* deserves its rank as the greatest work of its age on political philosophy; aiming, as it did, to survey all peoples and all ages, to classify all forms of government, to explain the

meaning and effect of all institutions. Montesquieu's hobby-horse subject, from which he liked to draw his material, was the English government. He classified political constitutions under three heads, republic, monarchy and despotism; dependent on the guiding principles respectively of public virtue, of honor and of fear. Thus, at the very outset, Montesquieu illustrates the characteristic French tendency to parcel the world into categories, and to make exhaustive classifications which do not always exhaust or in which overlapping varieties find no place. Yet no charge would have hurt Montesquieu more than this. He prided himself on an unbiassed judgment, on careful observation and unprejudiced inference. There can be no better evidence of this than his attempt, more fully developed by later writers, to express the influence of climate and of environment on national characteristics. He also preached liberty and tolerance, and in general those feelings which the new spirit of the times was developing.

Consequently Montesquieu's work became one of the important influences which bore on the development of the American Constitution. He was the interpreter of the principles at the basis of the English government, and when the framers of the Constitution undertook to draft that document and to express by it the same fundamental concepts of political liberty, it was from the *Esprit des lois* that they drew much of their material. In a long chapter of the eleventh book Montesquieu analysed the English "constitution," which he considered so wise. Chief among its provisions, ensuring the equilibrium and adjustment of parts, was what Montesquieu developed in his theory of the division of powers into the executive, the legislative and the judicial elements. This theory was in part as old as Aristotle, and had been touched upon by as recent an author as Locke, but Montesquieu, with the spirit of drastic classification already alluded to, made the theory more rigid than the facts in England justified. Accordingly the drafters of the American Constitution, wishing to ensure perfect political liberty, established the

tripartite division of powers in all Montesquieu's completeness.[1] Hence the absolute differentiation between the President, the Congress and the Supreme Court. A natural consequence, illustrating the difference between England and America, appeared in that when the Cabinet officers (not ordained by the Constitution) were established, they were not, as in England, given seats in Congress, but remained advisers to the President.

One may perhaps carry still further the influence of Montesquieu on American institutions and say that, though the condition of the colonies made a federal union of small republics the most natural form of government, it was not without importance that Montesquieu declared federalism to have the advantages of most monarchies and republics combined.[2]

The Chancellor Daguesseau (1668–1751) is often compared, because of his upright character, to the great sixteenth-century chancellor Michel de l'Hospital. He was less successful in the executive post of chancellor than as a magistrate, because his judicial temperament made him see both sides of a question to the point of vacillation. His style was the heavy and stilted rhetoric fashionable in the seventeenth rather than in the eighteenth century, and, indeed, Daguesseau stood more for the old school of thought and manners against the radicalism of the *philosophes* or the flippancy of the regency and following years. It was during one of his forced retreats from authority, for his executive career was not uncheckered, that Daguesseau composed some of those writings which place him among the

[1] Montesquieu's observations of England referred to a single consolidated state, and not to a federation. H. Taylor (*Origin and Growth of the American Constitution*) attributes the first idea of such an application to a federal government to the writer Pelatiah Webster.

[2] It may not be amiss, in connection with Montesquieu, to recall the name of the abbé Du Bos (1670–1742). Montesquieu attacked very strongly the theory of the pacific occupation of Gaul by the Franks in Du Bos's *Histoire critique de l'établissement de la monarchie française dans les Gaules*. He was also the author of important *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et la peinture*.

moralists. But all his addresses, such as his *Mercuriales* (because spoken on Wednesdays) or harangues before the court or Parlement, deal with the ethics and morals of the jurist and with questions about justice in its varied aspects.

Charles Rollin (1661–1741) would probably never have entered literary history had it not been for work accomplished after he had reached the Psalmist's age. Through his long life he was an industrious and modest member of the University, "l'abeille de la France." He won professorships, principalates and rectorships of the University by his learning, was fond of his quiet garden with its fruit and flowers, was at times under official disapprobation because of his adoption of Jansenism and his opposition to the *Unigenitus* bull of Clement XI in 1713, condemning one hundred and one Jansenist propositions supposed to exist in the *Réflexions morales* of the Père Quesnel of the Oratoire. Later Rollin's Jansenism led him to excuse the excesses of the *convulsionnaires* of Saint-Médard.

His lifelong interest had been the classics, and in 1730 he published the first volumes of his *Histoire ancienne*, completed in 1737. Then, nothing daunted, he began an *Histoire romaine* which he did not live to finish, but which was completed by his friend Crévier, the author of an important history of the University. Thus, after his seventieth year Rollin produced twenty volumes. The task was less formidable than historical writing would be today, for he did scarcely more than paraphrase in an easy, somewhat monotonous style the old historians, but the feat remains none the less a remarkable one, and Rollin's history was among the chief sources of information to students of antiquity in the eighteenth century. His only other important work was a *Traité des études*, of significance merely from a pedagogical standpoint.

Luc de Clapiers, marquis de Vauvenargues (1715–1747), seems out of place in the early eighteenth century. Born just at the outbreak of wantonness following the reign of Louis XIV, and growing up in a selfish and satirical age, burdened through all

his brief life by ill-health and poverty, he presents a rare picture of cheerfulness and of a serene and judicial outlook.

The active years of his life were spent in military service, and so little was his training a literary one that his early study had scarcely gone beyond Plutarch, Seneca and such classical moralists read in translations. He fought as officer under the maréchal de Villars and the maréchal de Belle-Isle, and in 1742 shared in the dreadful sufferings of the latter's army retreating from Prague by forced and circuitous marches to avoid capture. Both of Vauvenargues's legs were frozen, and he had to leave the army with blighted ambitions and glory unachieved: It was he who wrote, "Les feux de l'aurore ne sont pas si doux que les premiers regards de la gloire." His application to enter the diplomatic service was neglected because he had no friend among the women of the court, he became disfigured by smallpox, almost blind, consumptive, and died soon after the publication of his volume of writings, which fell flat, before the completion of his thirty-second year and with his new ambition for literary glory unfulfilled. His chief works consisted of an *Introduction à la connaissance de l'esprit humain*, various moral, critical and literary reflections, "characters" and maxims. His life was, on the whole, a lonely one, though his character was sympathetic: he lost his most intimate friend, an officer named de Seytres, though this was partly compensated for by Fauris de Saint-Vincens and his kinsman the marquis de Mirabeau, father of the orator. Voltaire, too, discovered the ability of Vauvenargues and encouraged him with sincere praises.

Vauvenargues the moralist comes into juxtaposition with authors like Pascal, La Rochefoucauld, La Bruyère and Rousseau, and he differs from them all. He had in common with Pascal long days of physical suffering and, what Pascal did not have, blighted ambitions. Yet life did not present itself to him as a vale of tribulation and of sorrow, and man's reason did not seem to him that helpless bit of worthlessness that it was to Pascal. There is in Vauvenargues less a feeling of awe than in Pascal,

and there is in him even more moral grandeur, the αὐτάρκεια of the Stoic. None the less Pascal was an important influence on him. He could not sympathise with La Rochefoucauld's cold-blooded cynicism. As opposed to La Bruyère, whom he admired, Vauvenargues aimed less at a portraiture of man fitted into his environment than at a more abstract treatment. With Rousseau he has more in common than with any of the others because of the weight he gives to the emotions apart from reason, and he has been called a precursor of Rousseau. Vauvenargues's real literary influences were Pascal, Bossuet and Fénelon. The influence of Pascal was sometimes by way of reaction, as had happened with Pascal and Montaigne. In Bossuet he admired the grand style, which he fortunately did not try to imitate too much; to Fénelon he was drawn by that author's sympathy and amenity.

These two epithets applied to Vauvenargues himself help to explain much in him; the phrase of Marmontel, "cœur stoïque et tendre" perhaps does so even better. His sphere of interest was the moral man who stood alone without the help of revealed religion, for Vauvenargues was a deist. But the imperative which replaced religion came from a mitigated stoicism: It was not the calculating reason of his contemporaries, whether reacting against Jansenism or as out-and-out materialists. Reason, to him, was subordinated to feelings, to sentiment: "les grandes pensées viennent du cœur." This phrase of Vauvenargues is perhaps the keyote of his philosophy.

Though he thus paved the way for a sentimentalist such as Rousseau, and though his critical attitude points to impressionism and the absence of a standard of judgment, Vauvenargues himself never lost sight of the golden mean. The model character he has in mind has discarded reason directed to egotistical and self-centred purposes and acts by the impulses of its truer and higher nature. Virtue consists in the practice of benevolent impulses. Thus, though the collocation of names may seem paradoxical, Vauvenargues has something in him of the doctrine

of Rabelais's abbaye de Thélème that people have "un instinct et aiguillon qui toujours les pousse à faits vertueux et retire de vice." The virtuous man is he whose character is the expression of such feelings. And it is in action, bold and constant action, that they have their manifestation.

CHAPTER VIII

VOLTAIRE

FRANÇOIS-MARIE AROUET, the youngest of five children, was born at Paris, and not at Châtenay as was once supposed, in 1694. His father was connected with the law and his mother died when he was a mere child. He was a precocious youth and won high praise from his Jesuit teachers at their great school the Collège de Clermont, where the future apostle of theism and the arch-foe of religion became a pupil. Voltaire, as he was later to be called, never lost his friendly feeling, in spite of religious hostilities, for his former teachers, the P. Porée, the P. Tournemine, the P. Thoulier, the P. Le Jay. But towards an elder brother Armand, an ardent Jansenist, "le fanatique," his attitude became one of almost open enmity. The name Voltaire, under which he is famous, was perhaps derived from a small estate belonging to his mother, perhaps it was merely a rough anagram of "Arouet l. j." (Arouet le jeune).

Though destined to live more than eighty years, Voltaire was, as a child, weak and sickly. He was, however, full of life and animation, and he soon distressed his friends and teachers by dallying with the irreligious epicureans of the Temple. Ninon de Lenclos in her old age detected his extraordinary ability and left him money to buy books. To remove him from certain influences his father sent him to Holland, but there he fell in love with an intriguing French girl, Olympe (Pimpette) Dunoyer, and had to come home again only to renew old acquaintanceships. He made new ones, however; he became an attorney's clerk and in the office met Thieriot, who was long to be his inseparable but not always worthy friend. After getting into trouble by

the composition of a sensational poem called *le Bourbier* Voltaire was imprisoned in the Bastille in 1717 for a verse satire on the regent written really by an obscure author, known as the *J'ai vu* ("J'ai vu ces maux et je n'ai pas vingt ans") as well as for a Latin composition called *Puero regnante*. He made use of the imprisonment to plan his epic poem on the Ligue, known later as the *Henriade*, and to finish his play *Œdipe*, begun several years before and brought out with tremendous success in 1718. From this time on, Voltaire's dramatic triumphs, with a few exceptions, come rapidly.

Some years later, in 1725, Voltaire, now famous as a man of letters and satirist, offended the chevalier de Rohan, who had him thrashed with sticks ("voltairiser," said his delighted foes) by half a dozen bullies in the street. This kind of experience, strangely enough, generally injured the victim's reputation as well as his back, by making of him a laughing-stock. Voltaire not only failed to get satisfaction but he was again put in the Bastille. On his release, in 1726, his disgust at his experiences, and perhaps the consciousness that absence might be salutary, made him long for a freer air. He took his famous journey to England, were he made valuable friendships, Falkner, Bolingbroke, Congreve, Pope and Gay, and imbibed much of the philosophical spirit of rationalism which was to serve him in his religious controversies in later years. He found out the philosophy of Locke, the poetry of Pope, with whose vanity and irascibility he had much in common, the satire of Swift, the dramatic art of Shakspere, and began the accumulation of his vast fortune by the commercial success of the *Henriade*.

After his return to France at the end of less than three years he showed that his power of satire and invective had only been sharpened by absence: he made the critics furious by the *Temple du goût*, a work half in prose and half in verse, and angered people in general by the praise of England in the *Lettres anglaises* or *Lettres philosophiques*, virtually the outline of his philosophy and that of the age. They were an indirect criticism of

French society and of absolute government and praised the empiricism of Locke and the scientific spirit of Newton to the detriment of metaphysics and of revelation. A little while before, in 1731, Voltaire's first great prose work, the *Histoire de Charles XII*, had shown that he was capable of serious historical investigation.

In 1733 Voltaire became intimate with the marquise du Châtelet, a learned woman of tastes in sympathy with his own, and went to live with her at her country estate of Cirey, in Champagne, settling there definitely in 1736. The "divine Emilie" had a vigorous intellect, great scientific and philosophical aptitudes, knowledge of languages and literature, and a fierce passion for study:

> Mais je vois venir sur le soir,
> Du plus haut de son asphélie,
> Notre astronomique Emilie,
> Avec un vieux tablier noir
> Et la main d'encre encor salie.

Her reading ranged from Lucretius and Virgil to Milton and Locke, but above all she was the priestess of Newtonian science. At Cirey Voltaire spent many happy years, diversified by squabbles, with Mme du Châtelet. Together they studied and experimented in natural philosophy, acted plays and entertained visitors or found delight in managing the estate. To this period are due, besides several dramas, the *Eléments de la philosophie de Newton*, the *Essai sur les mœurs*, the first of his clever stories, *Zadig*, and the disgraceful *Pucelle*, the poem on Jeanne d'Arc, whose birthplace, Domrémy, was only a few leagues distant from Cirey. In 1746 he succeeded, after several unsuccessful efforts, in getting elected to the Academy. In 1749 Mme du Châtelet died, and Voltaire's grief was much lightened by the discovery that her fondness for him had yielded to a love-affair with the dashing officer and poet, the marquis de Saint-Lambert ("un clou chasse l'autre, ainsi vont les choses de ce monde").

Voltaire returned to Paris, where he found himself less in

favor in high circles than formerly. His familiarity annoyed Louis XV, and his ingratitude offended Mme de Pompadour, who had been kind to him. He avenged himself by the composition of some of his most brilliant satirical stories, and in 1750 he decided to accept the invitation of Frederick the Great, who for a long time had been urging him to come to Berlin. Frederick was deeply in love with French literature, he composed in French and had surrounded himself with a band of Frenchmen.

Voltaire therefore went to live near the king at Berlin and Potsdam. For a time they were as intimate as a king and an ordinary mortal can be, but matters soon began to take an unfavorable turn. Another Frenchman and former friend of Voltaire, Maupertuis, a native of Saint-Malo, was president of the Berlin Academy of Sciences. He became involved in a dispute with a scholar named König, in which Voltaire took König's part and attacked Maupertuis in a satirical pamphlet, the *Histoire du docteur Akakia et du natif de Saint-Malo*. Various other bickerings, including money squabbles with a Jew named Hirsch, made him leave Prussia in 1753, disgusted with his royal patron and subjected even to petty indignities by an official underling at Frankfort. None the less Voltaire's Prussian experience proved almost as useful as his English trip in enlarging his intellectual horizon. He had, moreover, done some important literary work, including the publication of the *Siècle de Louis XIV*, and various philosophical contributions.

After a brief period of wandering, Voltaire, whose opinions were becoming more and more outspoken and who even thought of emigrating to Pennsylvania, settled in a country home in Switzerland, near the Lake of Geneva, called *les Délices*. In 1760 he went to live on the direct limits of the two countries, the château of Ferney, where he spent the rest of his life, with his niece, fussy and vain Mme Denis, as housekeeper. Residence in Ferney was a convenient way of escaping the restricting laws of both nations. Voltaire made it a manufacturing centre, a resort for his many friends, and a busy laboratory of books

which he continually poured out, plays, stories in prose and verse, literary commentaries, philosophical and theological treatises. Even greater was his activity towards the annulment of certain miscarriages of justice and unrighteous condemnations, such as those of Calas, Sirven, De la Barre, and Lally-Tollendal.[1] He also expressed sympathy for the dead English admiral, Byng, executed "pour encourager les autres." Never in history did an old man and almost confirmed invalid ("je suis né tué") show more intense industry. In 1778 he was persuaded to come to Paris to enjoy the triumph of old age, but the change of régime and the festivities to which he was subjected soon killed him.

Voltaire is one of the extraordinary characters of literature. Hardly any one except Erasmus, with whom he has been compared, has caused more discussion or been more variously interpreted. To the conservative Catholic he is pre-eminently the symbol of irreligion and of immorality. To the liberal he was long the embodiment of the spirit of freedom and resistance to a narrow dogmatism. He made his mark in almost every division of literature in his age, and won an honorable if not an honored name.

Voltaire was not a deep thinker, but he accomplished more than many such because he gave vogue to inert and ineffective ideas. He was mainly a populariser, a journalist in spirit, a critic of the passing manifestations of life and thought. He gave intelligibility to philosophy, wit to prose, and elegance to poetry. His distinction is his universality.

If not a deep thinker Voltaire was a violent and a positive one, at least for the time being. It was the vigor of his religious views which made him a bugbear to the orthodox believers, who

[1] Calas, a peaceable Protestant of Toulouse, had been unjustly condemned for the murder of his son. Sirven was another persecuted Huguenot. The young chevalier de la Barre had been cruelly put to death for irreverence to religious images. Lally-Tollendal was the unfortunate commander who lost India to the French nation.

attributed to him an atheism which he never maintained. His mobility of intellect made him at times inconsistent: "Je suis assez semblable aux girouettes qui ne se fixent que quand elles sont rouillées." He seems to maintain directly opposite views on the freedom of the will. But he does not vary in his belief in the truth of God and the falsity of revealed religion. Voltaire is not an atheist, but a theist or deist[1] (he does not distinguish), convinced that there is a divinity that shapes our ends.

> Ce système sublime à l'homme est nécessaire;
> C'est le sacré lien de la société,
> Le premier fondement de la sainte équité,
> Le frein du scélérat, l'espérance du juste.
> Si les cieux dépouillés de son empreinte auguste
> Pouvaient cesser jamais de la manifester,
> Si Dieu n'existait pas, il faudrait l'inventer.

On the other hand, all creeds evolved to satisfy mankind's need for the concrete in religious life are false and mischievous. The deity is to Voltaire a species of unknown God, and the manifestations of Christianity are as untrue as those of the most ignorant paganism. He is ready to sign himself "Christmoque" and to open hostilities against Christ's followers. He detests the moral gymnastics of the Jesuits, but he loathes the Jansenists more. The spirit of narrow conservatism aroused Voltaire's ire, and every manifestation of it in the shape of religious intolerance and persecution he lumped together under one name, uttering against it the battle cry, "Ecrasez l'Infâme." Yet Voltaire was a conservative in everything except religion. Goethe called Voltaire the end of the old and Rousseau the beginning of the new.

Voltaire had experienced plenty of social intolerance himself and the arrogance of the haughty *seigneur* who had had him thrashed in the street. The spirit of rebellion against this he

[1] A theist is considered a little less radical than a deist and less rabid against the ideas of a personal God and of revelation; cf. *Oxford Dictionary* s. v. *Deism* and *Deist*.

applied to all things. His tools were those of the English philosophers: the common-sense of Locke, the reasonings of Bolingbroke, and the spirit of civil liberty. These, together with the science of Newton, gave stability to his earlier epicurean indifference and enabled him to attack his foes with an irrefutable logic, partly inherited from Bayle, himself the precursor of the English deists. He did not care, as a rule, to go into the deeper problems of imaginative metaphysics, but confined himself to the inconclusive but no less irritating method of a strictly literal interpretation of his opponents' statements. Thus most of Voltaire's arguments lack the dignity of respectful hostility, many of them are but petty dialectic, yet they would invariably sting to madness. Nevertheless, even here Voltaire was not the worst of his kind, and to some eighteenth-century atheists a theist was almost a bigot.

The result of Voltaire's criticism was a purely destructive one. In its practical manifestation in the world of politics it accomplished some great good in rehabilitating the memory of victims of persecution, but even that was an undoing. In the sphere of morals he upset by *Candide* the smug optimism of those who, like Leibnitz or Pope, thought that all is for the best in the best of worlds, or that whatever is is right. Against this view the poem on the Lisbon earthquake is an eloquent protest:

> O malheureux mortels! ô terre déplorable!
> O de tous les mortels assemblage effroyable!
> D'inutiles douleurs éternel entretien!
> Philosophes trompés qui criez: Tout est bien,
> Accourez! Contemplez ces ruines affreuses,
> Ces débris, ces lambeaux, ces cendres malheureuses.

The general lowering of idealism Voltaire carries through consistently on the basis of a Newtonian instead of a Cartesian rationalism. Not only do the supernatural and the miraculous disappear from religion and faith, but their manifestations are directly taxed with being the humbug of deceivers or of tricky priests. Thus the portrayal of Mahomet as an impostor

might suggest that Christ was one. The whole metaphysical realm becomes unnecessary, and Voltaire is content to be a sceptic as regards the various keys to the mysteries of the world which cannot be explained by scientific reasoning. His arguments on the soul and the origin of knowledge are consistent with these fundamental premises. He is, on the whole, in agreement with the Encyclopedists that there are no innate ideas and that man is a mere machine.

This attitude seems to banish the necessity of a demiurgos, but says Voltaire:

> L'univers m'embarrasse, et je ne puis songer
> Que cette horloge existe, et n'ait point d'horloger.

There is a "Dieu rémunérateur et vengeur," [1] at least to make morals respected, and Voltaire believes in natural religion. Such is the underlying thought of the *Dictionnaire philosophique*.[2]

What leads us to believe in God is not sentiment, but the logical necessity of some beginning for the universe. Voltaire even conceives of a kind of adoration for the logical or scientific laws on which the universe rests, and for that reason the one metaphysician for whom he does feel some sympathy is the pantheist Spinoza, whose God may be conceived as the world-order endowed with divinity. In consequence Voltaire's theology remained inconclusive except as a weapon against the Catholic church, and therein men found it useful in the years which

[1] Rois, si vous m'opprimez, si vos grandeurs dédaignent
Les pleurs de l'innocent que vous faites couler,
Mon vengeur est au ciel; apprenez à trembler.

[2] Natural religion is to Voltaire belief in God and the practice of virtue. All dogmas are an excrescence devised by the priests with intent to deceive. Of the believer in this religion he says: "Faire le bien, voilà son culte; être soumis à Dieu, voilà sa doctrine. Le mahométan lui crie: 'Prends garde à toi si tu ne fais pas le pèlerinage de la Mecque! — Malheur à toi, lui dit un récollet, si tu ne fais pas un voyage à Notre-Dame de Lorette!' Il rit de Lorette et de la Mecque; mais il secourt l'indigent et il défend l'opprimé." — *Dictionnaire philosophique*, s. v. *Théiste*.

prepared the great Revolution. The dry light of its destructive reasoning could not satisfy the sentimental and emotional. On the other hand, its sarcasm and irony, so expressive of the French temperament, the spirit of the *frondeur*, ever prone to see the ludicrous side and to destroy by mockery, has always appealed to the radicals and free-thinkers who have so often controlled the thought of France.

But it was the realm of morals that, after all, appealed most to Voltaire. Regardless of its ultimate postulates, morality was to him theoretically what it is to all good men — truth, honor, and general righteousness. Consequently all forms of political persecution anger him as much as religious intolerance, and he admires the good fortune of a nation like England which is its own master, instead of being subservient to a despot's whim.

The vast array of Voltaire's writings in prose and verse are but the expression of these views. Though they are often inconsistent in individual cases, the underlying spirit is the same: intellectual destructiveness, social and literary conservatism.

Voltaire's greatest monument, though its vastness makes it less effective, is perhaps his correspondence. Throughout his long life he kept up a constant stream of letter-writing with his friends and foes of high rank and low degree. More than ten thousand of these letters are published, and they are far from exhausting the number he must have written, for others are often discovered or referred to. Scarcely one of them is valueless and nearly all are highly useful, whether to throw light on political, social, or literary theories, or merely as examples of clever satire and epistolary polemic. To his niece Mme Denis, when she is not keeping house for him, he describes the incidents of his daily life, or in the famous letter of the *Mais* he shows his growing discontent with the court of Frederick the Great; to Horace Walpole he writes on literary criticism. Frederick, Catherine of Russia, Diderot, D'Alembert, Helvétius, Vauvenargues, Marmontel, Rousseau, La Harpe, D'Argenson,

Algarotti, Maffei, Goldoni, Mme de Graffigny, Mme du Deffand, these are but a few of his many correspondents. Nor were these letters, in spite of their clearness and fluency, exercises in style: "I am writing my thirtieth letter today," says Voltaire on one occasion. And many of them were written or dictated when most persons would think themselves too ill to hold a pen or guide a thought.

The chief historical works of Voltaire are his *Histoire de Charles XII* (1731) and his *Siècle de Louis XIV* (1751), the *Essai sur les mœurs et l'esprit des nations* (1756), to which may be added the *Histoire de Russie* (1759). Herein lies, again, one of his fruitful achievements: he is among the first to conceive history as material for the formulation of general ideas and no longer as a mere register of reigns of kings, filled with battles succeeding each other in chronological sequence. Voltaire tries to deduce the underlying principles which explain the past and give due proportion to hidden motives as well as to concrete phenomena.[1] His historical studies aimed also at accuracy and were the result of patient research. The books on Charles XII and on Louis XIV were based on direct investigation and the questioning of eye-witnesses. The first is largely a biographical narrative of a dashing military hero, written, it is true, by an interpreter of character rather than of strategy. The second is a survey of the arts and sciences as well as of history. It is Voltaire who, to a great extent, gave the reign of Louis XIV its pre-eminent rank in French intellectual tradition. The composition of the history of Russia was made more difficult by his ignorance of the country and of the language. The *Essai sur les mœurs* is, in the main, an exposition of the tendencies

[1] "Chez toutes les nations l'histoire est défigurée par la fable, jusqu'à ce qu'enfin la philosophie vienne éclairer les hommes; et lorsque enfin la philosophie arrive au milieu de ces ténèbres, elle trouve les esprits si aveuglés par des siècles d'erreurs qu'elle peut à peine les détromper; elle trouve des cérémonies, des faits, des monuments, établis pour constater des mensonges." — *Essai sur les mœurs.*

and feelings of the human race at the different periods of its history and of the lessons to be derived therefrom.

The literary criticism of Voltaire is scattered through all his prose and poetry, including the *Dictionnaire philosophique*, the *Siècle de Louis XIV*, and the correspondence, and particularly the *Commentaire sur Corneille*. The criticism of Corneille, whose works Voltaire edited in order to provide a dowry for one of Corneille's kinswomen, is a curious instance of carping at a great author for not submitting to petty fashions of taste and of language, many of which had not been accepted when the plays were composed. Voltaire's attitude is that of the ultra-conservative pseudo-Classicist. Smoothness, regularity, clearness appeal to him, and innovations terrify. Racine and Boileau are his deities, the former for his perfect language, the latter for his rigid intellectuality in taste and criticism. He is an instance of the divergence of attitude often noticed in men between their literary views and their theories of political or social action.

The modern reader finds perhaps greatest pleasure in Voltaire's prose stories, his *contes*, *romans*, and *nouvelles*. These almost always conceal satire in the narrative. The Oriental apologue was much in vogue in the eighteenth century and Voltaire contributed to its popularity, but the reader of his stories knew that they applied to the time in which they were written. *Zadig, ou la destinée* (1747), the story of a righteous man of Babylon who falls from prosperity to poverty and comes back to wealth, shows that the ways of Providence are hidden from us. *Micromégas* (1752), suggested by Cyrano de Bergerac and *Gulliver's Travels*, is an "histoire philosophique," the adventures of an inhabitant of the star Sirius who travels among the planets and surveys the philosophical systems of mankind. It is directed against Catholicism and opposes astronomy to St. Thomas Aquinas and the anthropocentric view. *Candide* (1759) is an attack on the optimism of Leibnitz; *Jeannot et Colin* shows the excess of feminine influence in education; *Le Monde comme il va* satirises French life and Paris manners;

L'Ingénu and *la Princesse de Babylone* are less specific in their general mockery.

The so-called *Mélanges* contain all kinds of writing from the *Lettres philosophiques*, Voltaire's important survey of the English people, to essays, notes, or fragments on matters of religion or science.

This is far, however, from exhausting the activity of Voltaire. His verses are as miscellaneous as his prose writings, and in most cases as deserving of study. His epic poem, the *Henriade*, is a semi-historical account of the wars of religion in the sixteenth century and the deeds of Henry IV. As inspired poetry it is dull, as historical narrative in verse it is often vivid and picturesque. The *Pucelle*, Voltaire's most discreditable work, is the reverse of this medal. Philosophical poems are the *Discours sur l'homme*, the *Poème sur la loi naturelle*, and the *Poème sur le désastre de Lisbonne*. The general ideas of his prose writings are here often repeated in striking phrases.

In addition to all this achievement, Voltaire found time to write miscellaneous verses of all kinds, epigrams, odes, sonnets, and madrigals, the grace and wit of which have done as much to make his reputation permanent as many of his more ambitious works. And he never rested in his production of the one or the other kind: his enemies were numerous, his wit was caustic, they hated him and he them; so that his biography is largely colored by his fierce controversies with rival scholars, poets, and journalists from Maupertuis to Jean-Baptiste Rousseau and Jean-Jacques, Le Franc de Pompignan, Fréron, La Beaumelle, Desfontaines.

Voltaire, though not an enigma, is a queer mass of contradictions: a coward, he did some heroic deeds; a foe to religion, he made religion and the world more honest; a sneering satirist, he helped to bring about mercy and tolerance; a dramatic conservative, he suggests the melodrama and "spectacle"; an apostle of destruction, he made possible, though he had no share in it, the reconstruction of French society. Though a

leering cynic,[1] a "singe de génie" as Hugo called him, with the "hideux sourire" of which Musset speaks in *Rolla*,[2] he was kind to his friends and gentle with many an ungrateful and undeserving person. Though vain and conceited he did some of the most courageous and altruistic deeds of his time.

[1] You are so witty, profligate and thin,
At once we think you Milton, death and sin. —
Young, author of the *Night Thoughts*.

[2] Dors-tu content, Voltaire, et ton hideux sourire
Voltige-t-il encore sur tes os décharnés?

CHAPTER IX

ROUSSEAU

JEAN–JACQUES ROUSSEAU was born in Geneva in 1712, but his family was ultimately of French descent. His mother died at his birth and he was left to the care of his father, an emotional and unpractical man, whose sensitive temperament was inherited by his younger son Jean-Jacques. Together they used to whimper over the high-flown fiction of the seventeenth-century novelists or read the biographies of Plutarch until the morning sun shone in at the window. Various incidents of Rousseau's youth tended to make him self-centred and morbid, and finally he ran away from Geneva when he was sixteen, abandoning his master, an engraver to whom he was apprenticed, and began his wanderings. He found himself before long in the house of Mme de Warens, a young and attractive Catholic convert, at that time twenty-nine years of age, intelligent and sympathetic, but eccentric as regards morality and social obligations. For many years, with interruptions, she and Rousseau lived in a strange intimacy, at times shared with a third, though they always knew each other as "maman" and "petit."

Mme de Warens undertook to have Rousseau converted to Catholicism and sent him to a monastery at Turin, where he was put through a mechanical process and then ejected into the street. For some time, except for intervals spent with Mme de Warens, Rousseau was a wanderer over the face of the earth, filling all kinds of occupations from lackey in a family to hypochondriac roadside wanderer or music-master, in the latter position at first covering himself with ridicule.

In 1738 and 1739 took place the residence at les Charmettes, near Chambéry, where Rousseau and Mme de Warens, not alone as he asserts in his *Confessions*, but in company with another lover of hers, named Wintzenried, lived a rustic and "idyllic" life amid the country flowers and sounds. Rousseau devoted also more time to study than he had hitherto done, and in 1740 he became private tutor at Lyons in the family of M. de Mably, brother of the writer Mably and of Condillac. Here the future theorist on education failed again, and in 1741 he went to Paris to make his fortune by his invention of a new system of musical notation. After meeting with failure in this, he managed to get the position of secretary to the French ambassador at Venice. Dismissed by him in disgrace after various quarrels, Rousseau fell into deep poverty and formed a *liaison* with an ignorant and vulgar servant girl, Thérèse Levasseur, with whom he lived for many years before he even made a pretence of marrying her, and who inflicted on him the burden of her family. Rousseau sent his own five children, as they were born, to the foundling asylum and never knew anything more of them. He managed, however, to keep his head above water and had more friends than his susceptible and emotional nature would lead one to expect. He was slow and reserved in conversation, possessing only that *esprit d'escalier*, as he called it, which enabled him to conceive the proper reply, what he ought to have said, when he was on his way down-stairs. His very timidity and *gaucherie* won him the sympathy of several distinguished women.

He got to know important men of letters as well, D'Alembert, Grimm, Diderot. The latter is, indeed, indirectly connected with Rousseau's first famous literary achievement. One hot summer's day in 1749, while walking to Vincennes to see Diderot, then in prison, Rousseau read in the *Mercure de France* that the Academy of Dijon offered a prize for a dissertation on the subject "Si le progrès des sciences et des arts a contribué à corrompre ou à épurer les mœurs." He experienced a violent mental and emotional crisis, his theories of life took form, and he wrote the

Discours sur les lettres et les arts which won the prize in 1750 and made him famous, though success turned his head. He thought the assumption of a brusque and insolent demeanor would be in keeping with his theories of the corrupting influence of civilisation. He posed as a new Alceste in Molière's *Misanthrope*. So he dressed himself roughly, chose to earn his living by copying music, and was rude to everybody.

In spite of his pride and assumption of boorishness, which involved him in literary disputes, Rousseau's popularity continued. He wrote a successful opera, the *Devin du village* (1752), an unsuccessful comedy, *Narcisse*, and in 1754 a new essay by which he tried without avail to win a second prize from the Dijon Academy, the *Discours sur l'origine de l'inégalité parmi les hommes*, published in 1755.

A friend, Mme d'Epinay, the author of important memoirs, offered him a cottage known as the Ermitage in the forest of Montmorency, and there she installed her "bear" in 1756 in the solitude of the country. Rousseau lived there in contentment for some time, in spite of Thérèse's aversion to a rural life, until a violent passion for Mme d'Houdetot, the sister of Mme d'Epinay and mistress of the Saint-Lambert whose name is connected with Voltaire and Mme du Châtelet upset his peace. Mme d'Houdetot, though lacking beauty, was vivacious and interesting, but she felt no particular fondness for the uncouth manhater and womanlover. Her good-nature made her humor him until Rousseau was driven almost crazy. He quarrelled with all his friends, Grimm, Diderot, and Mme d'Epinay, and broke with them, leaving his cottage in 1757. His hostility to Grimm and Diderot lasted until the end of his life. He never ceased accusing them of conspiring to destroy his good name and happiness, and he became an enemy of the Encyclopedists.

For a time Rousseau remained in the neighborhood at Montmorency, ultimately under the protection of M. and Mme de Luxembourg, and wrote his *Lettre à d'Alembert sur les spectacles* in answer to some statements favorable to the drama in an

article which the latter had written in the *Encyclopedia*. This was followed by *Julie, ou la nouvelle Héloïse* (1760), a half biographical novel, at least so far as Rousseau's emotional life with Mme d'Houdetot was concerned, and reeking with sentiment. It created a perfect furore: once the book had been opened the reader was unable to put it down unfinished. It was followed in quick succession by the *Contrat social* and by *Emile* (1762). The latter of these two books was considered by the authorities subversive of religion, and the Parlement and ministry, though with no serious hostility or intention of injuring Rousseau, but as a counterblow to the expulsion of the Jesuits and to show impartiality, decreed his arrest. Rousseau withdrew, though without concealment, to Switzerland. His own country was less lenient than France had been and he went to Motiers, where he was under the government of the king of Prussia. He remained there in peace for over three years until new polemics, particularly the *Lettres écrites de la montagne* in answer to the *Lettres écrites de la campagne* of the Genevan Tronchin, and containing a violent attack against the state and its religion, caused even the people of Motiers to turn against him. Rousseau was stoned by them and fled to a lonely little island in the Lake of Bienne, afterwards going to England at the invitation of David Hume. Rousseau, who had become practically insane, soon thought that Hume was a scoundrel desirous of making him ridiculous, and fled from the home which had been offered him. He left England, and after many wretched wanderings he returned to Paris in 1770. He had, meanwhile, married Thérèse and written his extraordinary *Confessions*. During the last eight years of his life he dwelt in the rue Plâtrière, now rue Jean-Jacques-Rousseau, again earning his living by copying music, and for a time apparently somewhat mollified towards man and friendly to Bernardin de Saint-Pierre. He wrote during this period his Dialogues (*Rousseau, juge de Jean-Jacques*) (1775–6) and the *Rêveries d'un promeneur solitaire* (1777–8). Finally his health, physical and mental, both gave way

entirely, and on July 2, 1778, he died of a stroke of apoplexy, though many have absurdly maintained that he committed suicide.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, like Voltaire, is one of the paradoxes of literary history. His life was full of antitheses and his influence was the opposite of what might have been expected from him. He lived for years in open violation of moral laws and was the victim of erotic madness, yet he preached virtue; he sent his children to the foundling-asylum and wrote on how to bring up the young; through pride or timidity he did his best to injure his own reputation, yet he became, with Voltaire, the most famous man of his century; he was brutal to his friends, yet they were often kind to him to the verge of unreason; he was inordinately selfish and taught altruism; he declared civilisation to be a failure, yet his teachings revolutionised theories of government; he was an idler and often a ne'er-do-well, yet he inspired one of the most important literary movements in France and in Europe. He saw visions and had dreams which his idleness made it difficult for him to carry out, a task he left to others. They put into practice his seemingly wild cerebrations.

Rousseau was never wholly sane and he ended in insanity. He had a constitutional infirmity which caused him all his life actual physical suffering or the morbid fear of it. It took the external form of the dread of persecution and the roving tendency of the "dromomaniac." The whole environment of his boyhood, as well as his ancestral influences, had emphasised his emotions rather than his judgments. His reading of novels and the false heroics of Plutarch were unsuited to the development of his peculiar character. The various adventures of his youth and his wanderings made him more and more the prey of fancies than of cold reason. It was, however, particularly after the disastrous outcome of his unpalatable love affair for Mme d'Houdetot that he became crazy and looked upon himself as the victim of human hostility. The intense exaggeration of his ego which

made him in his own eyes the centre of the world made him write in his *Confessions:* "Les planchers sous lesquels je suis ont des yeux, les murs qui m'entourent ont des oreilles; environné d'espions et de surveillants malveillants et vigilants, inquiet et distrait, je jette à la hâte et furtivement sur le papier quelques mots interrompus qu'à peine j'ai le temps de relire, encore moins de corriger." He thought himself the victim of the Jesuits, the Jansenists, and the philosophical sect. To a certain degree he was attacked by Grimm, Diderot, and Mme d'Epinay, and the memoirs of the latter were modified in a way more unfavorable to him as their hostility increased. But Rousseau's susceptibility saw only foes, and even those who, like Hume, tried at first to be kind to him met with vituperation. Meanwhile, as sometimes happens in one of self-analysis and unhealthy brooding, he manifested a fondness for communicating to the world at large the inmost secrets of his nature, of undressing his soul as well as his body, and of exhibiting at the bottom of his heart the "slumbering hog."

Yet Rousseau must have had good qualities, inasmuch as he had such devoted friends. When in his right senses he must have had an open heart and a sympathetic mind. Mme de Latour worshipped him, as Péronnelle d'Armentières did Guillaume de Machault, though she met him but once or twice; even the gruff old Scotsman Lord Keith, with whom he sought refuge after the publication of the *Contrat social* drove him from France, became his friend and protector.

Rousseau is the chief in France of the so-called sentimentalists. He gave new vogue and a new form to that emotionalism which, as James Russell Lowell pointed out, had had its first representative in the modern world in Petrarch. He brought a reaction against the rigid dogmatism of the Classical school and its effort to judge everything by an outside standard. He was, in one way, the first of the impressionists, a new Protagoras to whom man is the measure of all things. He discarded the old idea that certain definite rules preside over the composition

of each kind of literary work, and for the rule of the absolute in taste he substituted relativity.

In life and its literary expression the same condition shows itself. When man passes from liberty to the constraints of civilisation he undergoes a perversion. Both the psychological and the social process are a kind of degeneration of which the transition is reflection. The happiest state, therefore, as well as the best, is the state of nature, before civilisation has made its injurious consequences felt, when ignorant man lived in peaceful and unreflective bliss.

The consequence of this was the ultra-personal note in Rousseau's writings, the tendency to magnify the emotions, to dwell on the sufferings of the hero as an interpreter of the author, to confuse often mere vehemence of "sensibility" or feeling with virtue. Nature was identified with this and came almost to mean God. Egotism became the marked quality of the literature written under the influence of Rousseau, and of the hero of the Romantic school, the abnormally developed, selfish emotionalist brooding over his woes, fancied or real, suffering from the *mal de René* or the *mal du siècle*, and various forms of fatty degeneration of the feelings. These emotions could be, as in Rousseau's own case, of the amorous nature and the expression of a life, like his, amenable to women, in a society strongly dominated by the feminine element.

Though Rousseau's life is such a paradox, there is general consistency in his writings, which have a constructive as well as a destructive side and try, while showing the abuses of society, to point out, in ways often seemingly unpractical, how man may be brought back to nature and made better.

The first proclamation is in the *Discours sur les lettres et les arts*, already mentioned, of which the sudden inspiration has been related according to Rousseau, but wherein unfriendly critics have, without foundation, suggested that Diderot told him he could gain greater notoriety by maintaining a paradox. The theory of the *Discours* is that the uncouth savage, whom we

now know to have been at war with his neighbor, ignorant and brutal as a wild beast, was without the vile defects of treachery, deceit, and arrogance which are so apparent in our modern civilisation. Rousseau apparently believed, like the ancients, in an early Golden Age, or that uncivilised man was on a level with our first parents before the Fall. Every effort of man to advance has been like the opening of Pandora's box by the misfortunes it has produced; Egypt, Greece, Rome, China, all found that civilisation only weakened them and made them a prey to ruder but stronger civilisations. The old Persians, the Scythians, the Germans, the primitive Romans, the savages of America, the Swiss, the Spartans, all proclaim the advantage of simplicity and a primitive life. The arts and sciences were born of idleness and encourage it; they are a waste of time, and bring about corruption of society and of taste, through the unfortunate rise of inequality among men, which is the consequence of the pursuit of knowledge and the distinction of talents.

The topic of inequality is further pursued in Rousseau's second *Discours*. This essay on the origin of inequality is a direct sequel to the previous one. Rousseau maintains, as before, that the primitive unreflecting age was the best, and ventures upon a purely imaginary portrayal of those happy days, a picture so different from the views of Hobbes and of the English school which had hitherto been in vogue. "On n'a jamais employé tant d'esprit à vouloir nous rendre bêtes," said Voltaire sarcastically, "il prend envie de marcher à quatre pattes quand on lit votre ouvrage." [1] In the state of nature, then, men lived without virtue or vice, and each step towards

[1] So Palissot in his satirical comedy *les Philosophes* in which he lumps Rousseau indiscriminately with the Encyclopedists:

> Pour la philosophie, un goût à qui tout cède,
> M'a fait choisir exprès l'état de quadrupède;
> Sur mes quatre piliers mon corps se soutient mieux,
> Et je vois moins de sots qui me blessent les yeux.

perfectibility has been a retrogression, until human society has been converted into a state of warfare. The first step was the establishment of law and property: "Le premier qui, ayant enclos un terrain, s'avisa de dire: Ceci est à moi, et trouva des gens assez simples pour le croire, fut le vrai fondateur de la société civile. Que de crimes, de guerres, de meurtres, que de misères et d'horreurs n'eût point épargné au genre humain celui qui, arrachant les pieux ou comblant le fossé, eût crié à ses semblables: Gardez-vous d'écouter cet imposteur; vous êtes perdus si vous oubliez que les fruits sont à tous, et que la terre n'est à personne." The second step was the establishment of the magistracy, and the third the growth of arbitrary power. Thus have deviated rich and poor, strong and weak.

This work is even more paradoxical in its conclusions than the first, since it goes counter to all explanations of society and argues for a dissolvent which, all experience shows, would lead to anarchy. Rousseau is one of the precursors of modern anarchy, as he is in other writings of modern socialism.

The *Lettre à d'Alembert sur les spectacles* was a reply to d'Alembert's article on Geneva in the *Encyclopedia* which had advocated the re-establishment there of dramatic performances. Rousseau, of course, remained Swiss and un-French in much of his religious feeling and his political ideas. The letter is in a strain of puritanical moralising, and denounces the best play as deleterious in effect: the emotions which tragedy awakens are transitory, comedy teaches ridicule of worthy things. Moreover, the theatre is a resort of vanity, if not of vice. Poets and playwrights are as useless as those learned men who contributed to the unhappy progress of civilisation. In contrast with this condition of affairs Rousseau, imbued with his recollections of

> En nous civilisant nous avons tout perdu:
> La santé, le bonheur, et même la vertu.
> Je me referme donc dans la vie animale;
> Vous voyez ma cuisine: elle est simple et frugale.
> (*Il tire une laitue de sa poche.*)

Plutarch, describes the pleasures and sports of simple village-life, and games and rivalries like those of the old Spartans.[1] These idyllic visions the Convention tried to realise by instituting holidays and republican festivals.

Julie, ou la nouvelle Héloïse is Rousseau's most important romance. It deals with the topic which had already had two illustrious examples in the French literature of the seventeenth century, *Polyeucte* and the *Princesse de Clèves*, the fidelity of a woman for her husband in spite of her love for another man. Rousseau's development is, however, very different, and his chief inspiration is rather Richardson's *Clarissa Harlowe*, that epistolary romance of sentiment which he imitates partly as to form and partly as to content. The story tells, as in the old one of Abélard and Héloïse from which it takes its name, how young Julie d'Etanges is loved and seduced by her tutor Saint-Preux. Her father is unwilling to let her marry a plebeian and she becomes the wife of the sedate and elderly M. de Wolmar, while Saint-Preux, in despair, departs for long travels. On his return, M. de Wolmar, who has learned the truth, calls Saint-Preux to his house and, to show confidence in his wife and her former lover, encourages their friendship and lets them meet with absolute freedom. Julie, who has become a perfect *ménagère*, finally dies with words of love for all upon her lips, leaving her lachrymose friends to mourn her loss. Thus, with a different ending, the subject of *Julie* and of *Clarissa Harlowe* is love yielding to duty. Further than that, in this novel also in letters, the characters of Julie and of her cousin Claire are reproductions of Clarissa and of Miss Howe.

But *la Nouvelle Héloïse* is not a mere literary adaptation. It is also deeply stamped with Rousseau's own emotional experiences. It was during its composition that Rousseau knew

[1] "Plutarque surtout devint ma lecture favorite; le plaisir que je prenais à le relire sans cesse me guérit un peu des romans; et je préférai bientôt Agésilas, Brutus, Aristide, à Orondate, Artamène et Juba." — *Confessions*, Book I.

Mme d'Houdetot, and she with others of his acquaintance entered the romance. Julie herself had something of Mme d'Houdetot and of Mme de Warens. Wolmar and the English friend and counsellor, mylord Edouard Bomston, were undoubtedly influenced by Saint-Lambert. But Saint-Preux is above all Rousseau with his combination of sentiment and of erotic feeling. He is timid and clumsy except when carried away by passion. Julie is a strange example of conscious chastity, and the love-scenes are supposed to present an *ivresse de volupté* combined with modesty.

The general effect of reading Julie today is one, partly of tedium at the discourses on varied topics from education to housekeeping, with which the latter portions are to a considerable degree interspersed, partly of surprise that this eminently physical novel, of which portions are steeped in "âcres baisers" and suggestive episodes, should have been looked upon as a lesson in morality. But account must be taken of the standards of the age; the *ménage à trois* of Voltaire, M. and Mme du Châtelet did not surprise people any more than did the one which Rousseau dreamed of between himself, Mme d'Houdetot and Saint-Lambert, or the one which he has represented in Julie, M. de Wolmar and Saint-Preux. Moreover the phrases of chaste amorousness with which the whole book is smeared seemed less hackneyed and unreal than they do today and were a wholesome reaction against the indecency of much of eighteenth-century social life.

The *Contrat social* and *Emile* are Rousseau's constructive works, the one dealing with the political rights and duties of the grown man, the other with the training of the child. The *Contrat social* was, indeed, the document on which the principles of the French Revolution were based. The documents of the Tiers-Etat and of the States-General renewed the principles of Rousseau upon liberty, public duties, and the responsibility of officials. Indeed, the French Revolution carried the author's precepts to their logical conclusion, it is true, but far beyond his

definite statement. Not only did the *Contrat social* become the guiding principle of the Jacobins in rigidity of theory and action, but the spirit of this and of *Emile* led Robespierre to his cult of the Supreme Being and the theatrical religion of sentiment which he opposed to the cult of Reason of the Voltairean atheists. The rhetoric of Rousseau and his terminology inspired many of the catch-words of the Revolution, such as "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," the use of "citoyen" and the rhetorical declamation in which the artificial spirit of Plutarch's heroes was made to do service for the new liberty. As time went on, the theories of the social contract, by their application to economic instead of purely political contingencies, grew into the fundamental law of modern socialism and co-operation. Thus Rousseau is responsible for the theories both of the No-State and of the All-State, besides the intermediate form of the cantonal or communal small state of which Sparta, primitive Rome, and old Geneva were suggestions to Rousseau himself, and which the Paris insurrectionists in 1871 tried to carry out from the point of view of the smaller entity.[1]

The *Contrat social* is an instance of reasoning based upon purely *a priori* assumptions. Its inspirer was partly Locke and his teaching that men are born free, equal, and independent, and the idea of the origin of sovereignty in a compact or contract, partly Hobbes and his view of the omnipotence of authority. On the other hand, it need not be forgotten that Hobbes believes in the wickedness of man and Rousseau in his primitive goodness.

The *Contrat social* starts from the assumption that there was a moment in the history of society when a social compact became necessary in the mutual relations of the individual to himself and to his fellow-men. Hence the contract by which each one became a part of the Sovereign State or People. Of this People

[1] M. Edme Champion's book on Rousseau and the Revolution is an attempt to whitewash Rousseau and make him guiltless of its excesses.

the citizen or subject forms a part retaining equal rights of association, but obliged to yield under penalty, even of death, in each case where the will of the individual or of the minority comes into conflict with that of the majority. For the majority expressed, by form of law, the General Will of the inalienable and indivisible sovereignty of the people. The all-powerful state takes the specific form of different kinds of government, such as monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy.

The views on religion expressed in the *Contrat social* are identical with those of *Emile*. This is a pedagogical romance in five books dealing with the education of Emile, the child of nature, who is to be brought up by new methods at variance with the old ones of rigid discipline and of over-emphasised memory-worship. The fifth book deals with the bringing-up of Sophie, destined to be Emile's companion.

Rousseau was not the first to preach innovations in education. Rabelais had done it; so had Montaigne, whom Rousseau had read; so had Locke, whom he knew as well. Scévole de Sainte-Marthe had also anticipated him in his *Paedotrophia*, which advocated the bringing-up of children at the breast. But Rousseau, more than all others, wrote at the psychological moment of reaction against the neglect of children in France and the relegating of children to nurses by frivolous and thoughtless mothers.

The presentation in *Emile* of a human being face to face with the contingencies of life to be overcome shares the influence of *Robinson Crusoe*, just as the book in turn influenced an abundant literature of which the moralisations of *Sandford and Merton* or the universal adaptability of the characters in the *Swiss Family Robinson* are instances. More than that, the writings of Rousseau, especially *Emile*, revolutionised thought in England and, above all, in Germany: Kant, Jacobi, Fichte, Herbart, Schleiermacher all felt the power of Rousseau in their views on sentiment, religion within the limits of reason, individualism. Goethe and Schiller, Herder were literary disciples. In peda-

gogy Basedow, Lavater, Pestalozzi, Froebel, Jean Paul Richter are all inspired by Rousseau, to whom we owe even the germ of modern kindergartens.

Emile, the hero of the book, is brought up as a child of nature and learns to be a free man under the guidance of a friendly tutor. Every effort is made to develop his true character according to his strength by contact with the things which he shall study, under guidance it is true, but by the effort of his own judgment and reason. Instruction from the printed text comes late: at twelve years of age Emile scarcely knows what a book is and his education has been negative. Even during adolescence, Rousseau thinks, instruction should be by observation instead of from text, the pupil should be led to work out his own science and learn how to make his own living by some handicraft. Carpentering is the best of trades, as being useful and artistic. (The wisest of men was a carpenter's son, Rousseau suggests elsewhere.) Books are useful only in so far as they are of value for moral instruction. Guidance is by example, and often by elaborately devised incidents intended to be of educational value.[1]

The fourth book of *Emile* is largely taken up by an exposition of Rousseau's religious creed. This was partly suggested by the English deists, partly by their common sources back to Plato, partly by personal influences, like the vague pietistic mysticism of Mme de Warens, which subordinated everything outward to inner feeling. It may be summed up in the words: Existence of God and immortality of the soul. When young Emile has almost reached manhood without having yet studied speculative problems or learned that he has a soul, the *vicaire savoyard* one day leads him to the top of a hill overlooking the Po and there, as they gaze upon the vast beauty of nature, the older man explains his religious philosophy, which is a form of deism. There is mind, there is matter, and matter is guided

[1] It was as disciples of Rousseau that the princes of France learned trades and that Louis XVI was a locksmith.

by the laws of an intelligent spirit or God. This is all that we need to affirm positively; our subjective feeling tells us that there is a God and the dogmas and creeds of revealed religion are so useless as to be an absurdity. Religion is not taught by books: "Toujours des livres!" Close books and go forth to see the proofs of God in nature. Not that Rousseau scorns Christianity; there remains in the mind of the traveller through both Protestantism and Catholicism a fondness for the spirit of charity and mercy, yet the knowledge of God does not come from the text of the Bible and Christ is the sweetest, the most polished, and the wisest of men:[1] "Une des choses qui me charment dans le caractère de Jésus n'est pas seulement la douceur des mœurs, la simplicité, mais la facilité, la grâce, et même l'élégance. Il ne fuyait ni les plaisirs, ni les fêtes, il allait aux noces, il voyait les femmes, il jouait avec les enfants, il aimait les parfums, il mangeait chez les financiers. Ses disciples ne jeûnaient point; son austérité n'était point factieuse. Il était à la fois très indulgent et très juste, doux aux faibles et terrible aux méchants. Sa morale avait quelque chose d'attrayant, de caressant, de tendre; il avait le cœur sensible; il était homme de bonne société. Quand il n'eût pas été le plus sage des mortels, il en eût été le plus aimable."[2] (*Lettres écrites de la montagne.*)

Thus Rousseau's religion is a natural religion, wherein God is worshipped in the heart as a God of peace and goodness. This may seem today reasonable enough, but in his time his scorn of creeds and of miracles made his views appear as destructive of faith as the religion of Voltaire, and brought about his persecution. This deism, it is indeed true, could in its logical consequences lead not only to the cult of the Supreme Being of Robespierre, but to vague pantheisms, perhaps spiritual, perhaps

[1] Rousseau hedges as to his divinity.

[2] This passage might have been written by Renan. Indeed, Rousseau paves the way for the æsthetic Christianity of Chateaubriand and Renan.

civil or social, in which the notion of God could be sublimated into a mere moral law or categorical imperative of conscience, without any element of reverence for a divinity, whether the Theophilanthropy of a Larévellière-Lépeaux or the fraternalism of the modern socialists.

About the time that Rousseau's wanderings and tribulations of his later life began, he started the composition of his *Confessions*. The indications of his morbid self-consciousness, the "hypertrophy of the self" as it has been called, show themselves and the work is one of the chief examples of nakedness in literature: "J'ai dévoilé mon intérieur tel que tu l'as vu toi-même, Etre éternel. Rassemble autour de moi l'innombrable foule de mes semblables: qu'ils écoutent mes confessions, qu'ils rougissent de mes indignités, qu'ils gémissent de mes misères: que chacun d'eux découvre à son tour son cœur au pied de ton trône avec la même sincérité, et puis qu'un seul te dise s'il l'ose, je fus meilleur que cet homme-là."

The work is far from being an accurate autobiography; the author's memory or feeling play him false; he antedates by two years and misrepresents his life at les Charmettes; the first books are full of idyls of the youthful wanderer, yielding to the pleasures of gaiety, or of no less sensuous and tearful meditation upon the harmonies of nature and the sweetness of sympathetic women; the last ones are tinged with insanity and the morbid melancholy of one who thinks that friends have turned against him and that all men are ready to betray him. Again and again crop out cynicism and a pathological desire to exhibit the sins of mind and body which have caused the *Confessions* to be classed among books recommended only with caution. The madness of Rousseau shows itself also in *Rousseau, juge de Jean-Jacques*, in which Rousseau defends Jean-Jacques against a Frenchman's attacks, but it is a madness full of method which makes the work useful for an understanding of his character. The *Rêveries d'un promeneur solitaire*, on the contrary, though written still later, manifest a return to outer

nature and a serenity of temperament which is, in a certain degree, a relief.

Such are the chief works of the unhappy Jean-Jacques, and they explain his character. He was, at any rate in his later life, insane, and he was a moral pervert, yet he was a genius. He suffered among other things from a disease of the will-power, yet he incited countless men to action; his life was one of indifference to the codes of respectability, yet he preached virtue, chastity, and the observance of simple and housewifely qualities among women: "Non, Julie, non, femme respectable, vous ne verrez jamais en moi que l'ami de votre personne et l'amant de vos vertus"; he failed as a private tutor, yet he revolutionised the education of the young.

Should one seek a single key to Rousseau, it may perhaps be found in the word "Nature." Rousseau magnified the nature of the individual and of society, as opposed to the result of cultivation and of training. His whole character was moulded by sensation: "Je sentis avant de penser; c'est le sort commun de l'humanité; je l'éprouvai plus qu'un autre." Man by himself and non-dependent is good; civilisation has been a wrong: "L'homme est né libre, et partout il est dans les fers." The transition from freedom to slavery is that from the absolute to the relative, from the independent to the dependent, from nature to culture, from the happiness of simplicity to the unhappiness of reflection and the relations which unite one man with another. Though Rousseau's writings try to save collective civilisation, his life was one of egotism. He, more than anyone, magnified the self and made it the centre of interest, until in the literature of the Romanticists it manifested itself in the subjectivity of lyric poetry or the broodings of a gloomy hero at war with the cosmos.

Finally, be it added, Rousseau sees simple man in the *environment* of simple nature and in communion with it. A roadside wanderer, as he had been, he brought literature back to the outdoor world and, for the first time, made it understand the beauty of country sights and sounds, the majesty of the

mountains and waterfalls of the Alps in his own Switzerland and Savoy.[1] To Rousseau is largely due the transition from the artificial psychological analysis of an exhausted Classicism to nature-rhapsodies and descriptions. In the hands of his disciples it became the cult of exotic description and of *la couleur locale*.

[1] Haller's poem on the Alps, in German, was the first important instance before Rousseau of interest in the poetry and sentiment of the Swiss mountains.

CHAPTER X

DIDEROT AND THE ENCYCLOPEDIA

DENIS DIDEROT was born at Langres in 1713, of a good tradesman's family, which for many generations had been engaged in the manufacture of cutlery. His father was a kind and loving man who saw to his son's education, but was grieved when the young man refused to take up a definite profession instead of becoming a man of letters, and turned him adrift. For many years Diderot suffered great poverty, but he was of a sanguine temperament, and even married in 1743, though in no condition to support a wife. Unfortunately the marriage was not happy and Diderot was not a faithful husband. In 1749 he underwent a three months' imprisonment at Vincennes because of a case of feminine spite, on the ground of the irreligion of his writings, particularly the *Lettre sur les aveugles*. In this Diderot does advance from deism to atheism, and expresses views which he puts in the mouth of an English professor of Cambridge, Sanderson, who was blind, and whom Diderot makes to argue on the basis of his own blindness against God and final causes. The most important event of Diderot's life, in that it consumed his best years, was the editorship of the *Encyclopedia*. At one period (1773) he made a trip to St. Petersburg, invited there by the Empress Catherine, who had been extremely generous to him and had at one time, to help him, bought his library, leaving it in his possession and appointing him librarian with a salary. On his return from Russia he made a stay at The Hague. He died in 1784.

Diderot was a man of extraordinary diversity of genius. His brain was always seeing and foreseeing relations, reaching ahead of his contemporaries and suggesting theories, which he often

did not take the trouble to develop himself, but wherein later generations have corroborated him. His versatility, as often happens, stood in his way and made him ready to see all sides of a question or to pass from one to another before he had exhausted each topic.[1] To the editorship of the *Encyclopedia* and to the composition of romances, satires, plays, and literary or artistic criticism Diderot added important contributions to the growth of philosophy, and in many respects anticipated the modern theory of evolution. By a not uncommon fate, however, Diderot's works most read today are writings which he looked upon as relatively mere trifles, or which were not actually published by him.

As the *Encyclopedia* shows, Diderot in his cosmology does away with any intervention of revealed religion: Christianity is atrocious in its dogmas, preposterous in its sects and schisms, gloomy in its ceremonies. Rationalism, the freedom of reasoning, is the only principle to be used in spite of its fallibility, and though it may lead to scepticism and atheism. In fact, the first step towards true philosophy is incredulity. The value of metaphysics is thus destroyed, and philosophy becomes a natural science or a study of the higher laws of physics from which universal principles may be generalised. Knowledge is relative to our intelligence, man rationalises on the data of science, and philosophy is a form of what will later be called positivism, a materialism which refrains from theorising upon the ultimately unknown. Final causes, so dear to the older philosophers, and man at the centre of a universe leading up to him, are banished; man is considered as a stage in a continuous nature made up of facts, by synthesis based on the question *How* and not *Why*.

[1] Like Voltaire (cf. p. 510), Diderot was something of a weathercock: "Les habitants de mon pays ont beaucoup d'esprit, trop de vivacité, une inconstance de girouette. . . . La tête d'un Langrois est comme un coq d'église en haut d'un clocher, elle n'est jamais fixe dans un point. . . . Pour moi, je suis bien de mon pays." Quoted by Caro, *La Fin du dix-huitième siècle.*

Now nature is in a constant change under the influence of circumstances, a modifying environment which varies the organs. Here Diderot expresses views which are in one way as old as the flux of Heraclitus, but which are more familiar as set forth in Darwinism. He does it, moreover, before Lamarck, so often mentioned as the precursor of modern theorists on the transformation of the species.

As a man of letters, Diderot's chief merit rests today on his *Salons*, his chief popularity on his stories. In the *Salons* he invented a new method of art criticism. In 1759 he began writing about the paintings in the public exhibition held either annually or every two years. His method was to judge, not by canons of taste, but by interpretation, and though he never had the opportunity of Italian travel and consequent training in the observation of masterpieces, though his experience was confined to a school of trifling and of prettiness, no one was better able than he to explain the sentimental pictorial moralising of Greuze, the domesticity of Chardin or find fault with the insincerity of Boucher. No one excelled him in understanding the literary meaning of a picture.

A dialogue called *le Neveu de Rameau* is now one of Diderot's most quoted works, though its true text was not known until many years after his death. It is a dialogue between Diderot and the nephew of the composer Rameau, a good-for-nothing parasite, the example of cold-blooded selfishness and corruption, but giving forth constant flashes of common-sense. At the same time it contains elements of deep satire of the various literary opponents of the Encyclopedists, and, indeed, of human nature in general.

Jacques le fataliste et son maître is an instance of the Anglomania of Diderot. It is the result of Laurence Sterne and his *Tristram Shandy*, but without the successful humor of the English writer and with almost greater obscenity. The narrative, full of digressions and of general diffuseness, tells of the journey of Jacques and his master, with their conversations. One or

two episodes have snap, such as the story of Mme de la Pommeraye and the marquis d'Arcis and her vengeance on him for his faithlessness, by making him wed a worthless woman, but most of the work is ponderous and gross, an overdoing of Sterne; Jacques and his master represent Corporal Trim and Toby. Jacques and his master have hobby-horses like Uncle Toby, and Jacques's reiterated "Il était écrit là-haut" is an imitation of Trim's justification by King William. *La Religieuse* is inspired by Richardson, though he would have been shocked by it. It is a novel told in letters of a young girl, Suzanne Simonin, of illegitimate birth and thrust into a convent, who, anxious to escape from her prison, relates to a kind benefactor, the marquis de Croismare, the story of her persecutions by the depraved abbess. The frank descriptions of vice have caused the book to be usually classed among obscene works, and it has but little value. By a *supercherie* on the part of Diderot and some fellow-conspirators the letters were palmed off as genuine on the nobleman to whom they were addressed.

The other significant works of Diderot are, besides his correspondence particularly with Mlle Volland, the *Entretien avec d'Alembert*, the *Rêve de d'Alembert*, the refutation of Helvétius's book on man, and the *Bijoux indiscrets*, an obscene tale. Indeed, Diderot's imaginative writings were unbridled in their obscenity, just as his plays weary by their overladen sentiment and oppressive morality.

Diderot is important, then, in French literature as one of the universal geniuses, to be compared with Voltaire for his multifarious interests, to be placed above Voltaire for his power of synthesis, but is inferior in grace of style, in wit, in many of the qualities which cause books to be read after the author's death. Diderot's most ambitious efforts were connected with the progress of sciences destined to advance still further beyond his stage. His other writings were, in many cases, neglected and published only years after his death.

The scientific movement of the eighteenth century is illus-

trated by the history of the *Encyclopedia* and of its collaborators. The age was, in France, pre-eminently one of scientific progress, when the limits of the intellectual world were extended and the methods by which the conclusions were reached were all transformed. Yet, obviously the germs of the new tendencies are to be found in the previous period.

The seventeenth-century Cartesianism, with its generalisation from mathematical principles, had led to a cosmology based on mechanics. In the eighteenth century the influence of Newton's philosophy gave vogue to new theories of observation in the place of hypothesis. The attitude of thought in the seventeenth century had been a static one: the universe was conceived as a completed whole of which reason has worked out a knowledge. The world was a kingdom guided by the enlightened despotism of a monarchical deity. Literature was an effort to approach certain definite models, according to distinctly enunciated rules.

In the eighteenth century the centre of intellectual gravity is displaced. A new world is conceived of, in which there is freedom from God's laws, if not denial of him, and at the same time it is felt that thought is not in a stationary condition, but in one of continuous change towards an ultimate goal of perfection, it may be indefinitely remote, but towards which the human mind advances as science progresses. Obviously the chief element of intellectual interest has been transferred from art to science. Perfection lies, not in a past model of completed excellence giving æsthetic pleasure, but in the coming perfection of a growing structure. Of this movement the *Encyclopedia* is the representative and it finds expression in rebellion against dogma and the intolerance of the church, in cultivation of the liberties and rights of man, his senses, his reason. When kept within the bounds of moral action or under the guidance of standards of righteousness, such a movement can only be salutary; unfortunately, in divorcing religion and morality, the common underlying principles are apt to be forgotten.

The *Encyclopedia* was planned at a time when English influences were omnipotent in France, and was itself based upon an English work. Consequently the work is tinged with the influence of English thinkers; at any rate in scientific method. In pure thought Bayle was the ancestor of both Frenchmen and Englishmen. But it was Bacon who looked upon nature as something to be investigated, not in and for itself, but to make it serve as a tool.

Therefore, though the Encyclopedists work with reason as Descartes did, yet they use it rather as Bacon, and try to classify the sciences, discarding errors. Other Englishmen, however, besides Bacon, contributed to the development of the scientific spirit and method of the *Encyclopedia:* Hobbes emphasised the part that the state bears in the organisation of life; Locke taught the French to reject innate ideas and become historians of the human mind empirically considered, explaining ideas as emanating from the senses, besides preaching toleration; Newton, finally, discarded the physics of Descartes and enunciated the theory of gravitation which helped do away with the vortices of Cartesianism.

The French *Encyclopédie* was a fit successor to the great surveys of learning which had characterised another great encyclopedic age in the thirteenth century, of which the *Speculum* of Vincent de Beauvais is one of the chief examples in France. In 1728 the Englishman, Ephraim Chambers, published a work in two volumes called "A Cyclopædia, or Universal Dictionary of the Arts and Sciences." This work, though on a small scale and entirely compiled by Chambers himself, met with great success. About fifteen years later Mills, an Englishman, and Sellius, a German, planned its translation into French and entered into negotiations with the French bookseller Le Breton. The project was complicated by a quarrel over the privilege of publication, and before this was settled one of the translators was dead and the other had given up the task. Le Breton carried the work to one abbé Gua de Malves and then to Diderot. The

latter, with his universality of interests, welcomed the work but persuaded Le Breton to enlarge its scope tremendously, and in 1746, with the co-operation of other Paris booksellers, a new encyclopedia of knowledge was planned on a large scale, under the editorship of Diderot. He secured the protection of Chancellor Daguesseau and the assistance of d'Alembert, who wrote the famous *Discours préliminaire*. The first volume appeared in 1751, and for years the publication went on under the guidance of Diderot, in spite of constant difficulties, some due to jealousy, some to the concrete obstacles of a gigantic task of bookmaking.

The Jesuits were angered by its religious views and they were irritated by this new competitor to a dictionary of their own, the *Dictionnaire de Trévoux*. The Jansenists, once the opponents of oppression, not to be outdone by their rivals, also turned against Diderot and persecuted his friend the abbé de Prades, who was suspected of having written the theological articles. In 1752 the first two volumes were by royal decree suppressed, though this interdict was soon removed. Volume after volume was now issued in almost yearly succession, in spite of the reactionaries. The excitement was increased by d'Alembert's article on Geneva in the seventh volume, in which he praised the Protestant clergy to the detriment of the Jesuits and the Jansenists at home, and by the contemporary publication in 1758 of Helvétius's materialistic work *De l'esprit*, which was unjustly coupled with the *Encyclopédie*. Finally, Rousseau's *Lettre à d'Alembert* was a violent rejoinder to the view on the drama set forth in the article on Geneva.

Thus hostility was growing up among those who represented, or ought to have represented, the same liberalising tendency. Moreover d'Alembert fell ill and, discouraged, gave up his collaboration, so that Diderot was obliged to continue the general editorship unaided for seven years longer, writing articles, remodelling those of others, directing the compositors and the engravers of the plates. Finally a last blow was struck him by his own publisher, who, after Diderot had prepared the ten

concluding volumes which were to be put forth in a single issue, went through the proofs without his knowledge and mutilated all the articles which seemed likely to offend the authorities. In this way much of the material was, in Diderot's opinion, utterly ruined and his interest in the work destroyed. However, the last volume of letter-press appeared in 1765 and the volumes of plates a few years later, in 1772, a total of twenty-eight volumes.

To Diderot, then, more than to anybody else is due the credit for bringing to a conclusion this gigantic task. But he had assistants in perhaps fifty or sixty contributors, a "société de gens de lettres" as they called themselves, who wrote one or numerous articles and who ranged in reputation from fame to obscurity. Montesquieu, though he contributed personally only one article, on taste, is the source of inspiration for most of those dealing with institutions; Voltaire was a prolific writer for a period after 1755; Rousseau was in sympathy with the work until his quarrel with Diderot and his polemic with d'Alembert and wrote on music; Marmontel's views on literature took the place of Boileau's theories; Buffon and Turgot assisted; and a more obscure but no less meritorious helper, the chevalier de Jaucourt, toiled as unremittingly as Diderot himself at all kinds of miscellaneous and uninteresting but necessary hackwork, and was overcome with grief when the great labor was done.

The *Encyclopedia* had a twofold purpose, one object being perhaps more consciously felt than the other by the editors themselves. It was, in the first place, a vast dictionary of the arts and sciences, in which the whole body of human learning was described. Secondly, it was, in spite of incoherence and inconsistencies of fact, the mouthpiece of the philosophy which replaced the old metaphysics by the new psychology of a political and social entity. It displaced the older theories of the reasoning soul that were based upon logical conceptions and explained the mysteries of matter by intuitions; it interpreted mind by matter and went no further in dogmatic affirmation

than experience justifies; it did away with externally imposed religion and thus led the way, in its ultimate logical conclusions, to pure materialism. In the chief Encyclopedists themselves things did not go so far, and their attention was directed rather to the defects of civilisation in their own age. For that reason the articles of the *Encyclopedia* are often destructive criticisms of the faults of society, the abuses of government, and a plea for more enlightened ideas of institutions based on toleration, sympathy, and the various manifestations of justice. Positive sciences, such as physics and the practical applications of mathematics, were esteemed as conducive to social well-being; dogmatic theology was to be replaced by a religion of humanity.

The *Encyclopedia* was preceded by a prospectus and accompanied in 1751 by d'Alembert's famous *Discours préliminaire*, containing an exposition of the order in which the various branches of human knowledge arose and the history of the progress of learning in modern times. It was an attempt to give a synthesis of the field of knowledge. The defect was in being based on as definite assumptions as those of Cartesian philosophy, and in proceeding by a rationalism as artificial as any.

According to the *Discours préliminaire* the origin of knowledge is in the senses; from sensation come ideas. We learn, firstly, our own existence and then the existence of external things, including the body, which is so intimately connected with us that we realise it by an irresistible feeling. Yet d'Alembert experiences the same difficulty that all philosophers have in distinguishing ego and non-ego and in differentiating between phenomenon and noumenon.

Once the elements of our dualism are linked, d'Alembert is able to pass from theory on the origin of knowledge to its practical application. Our acquaintance of external things rests on their utility or harmfulness. By such means arise relations between men, the use of language, the organisation of society with its injustice, and by antithesis justice and the aspirations of the spiritual as opposed to the material life. By the same

principle of utility have come applied and pure sciences, such as agriculture and medicine on the one hand, mathematics on the other. In this manner d'Alembert constructs the realm of knowledge, classifying the sciences by the faculties of the mind which they bring into play.

Having set forth the logical connection of the divisions of learning, the author gives a historical survey of their growth and progress as a preparation for the specific articles of the dictionary.

So far as literature is concerned, with the exception of some articles on art, philosophy, and æsthetics, the *Encyclopedia* is worthless. So far as science goes, all its information has been superseded by the progress of that knowledge to which it was such a potent aid. Its value in its own time was, however, tremendous, and it was of assistance in pointing out defects in the social organisation and criminal legislation of the country, and in showing the way to the indefinite perfectibility which was a fundamental tenet of its philosophy. Social inequality, unfair privilege, judicial incompetence, superstition, all these were vices which the Encyclopedists laid bare under the knife of reason, and their attacks helped pave the way for the Revolution. They were never free from the defect of exaggerating the power of reason to explain, even in matters where the imagination rightfully plays a part. But the Encyclopedists are the best exponents of their age and of its tendency to scientific improvement.

CHAPTER XI

THE PHILOSOPHES AND THEIR FOLLOWERS

THE *philosophes*, the "Cacouacs" as Moreau called them, were the army of thinkers whose views were expressed as a rule by the *Encyclopedia*. They were a miscellaneous set not necessarily philosophers, without essential connection or mutual coherency, who set forth their ideas either in *salons* such as those of Mme Geoffrin, Mlle de Lespinasse, Mme d'Epinay, and the baron d'Holbach, or in their indiscriminate technical and non-technical writings. They were the intellectual revolutionaries whose theories made more easy the later social and political cataclysm. They were the foes of tradition and routine, voicing their opinions with surprising independence and outspokenness, for they came at a time when dissensions of all kinds had weakened the prestige of royalty and of religion. Their desire was to replace the rule of monarchy by that of humanity and the priesthood of God by that of science. The two whose influence has been most far-reaching in its effect on later thinkers were Condillac and Helvétius, the former as a semi-metaphysician and a psychologist, the latter as a political moralist and sociologist.

The abbé Bonnot de Condillac (1715–1780) was a voluminous writer on various topics, some of his works having been composed for the instruction of his pupil Ferdinand of Parma, the grandson of Queen Marie Leczinska. The most important is the *Traité des sensations*. Condillac is significant for his theories on the origin and growth of ideas, derived by him from transformed sensation, a transformation which he endeavored to illustrate. He tried to reduce the human understanding to a single principle,

that of perception, or sensation made conscious by attention. Condillac's famous illustration is the comparison of man to a statue in which sensations should be successively awakened: smell, hearing, taste, touch, sight. He neglected to realise that in human beings sensations are simultaneous. Condillac was influenced by Locke, though he pushed Locke's theories still farther, and, as a mathematician, he applied the exact methods of Descartes.

Condillac, it is plain, was a leader of the sensationalists, a school which tends towards an anti-religious attitude, because the need of a divine cause is diminished. He was himself a priest and, in general feeling, a theist, and many of his original followers conceived themselves orthodox. But, as his system won success, it influenced thinkers who went farther than he was willing to go; the tendencies of Condillac are to be found, not only among many of the Encyclopedist school, but in Helvétius, in Condorcet and the Idéologists, and in the nineteenth-century scientific positivists, whether in France or in England.

Claude-Adrien Helvétius (1715–1771), of German descent, was farmer-general of taxes and chamberlain of the queen, instead of physician as his ancestors had been. He was a well-to-do epicurean man of the world, who aspired to literary renown; so, after dabbling in poetry, he gave up his position and spent seven years in the composition of his work *De l'esprit*. This was a new and popular interpretation of character and of morals, full of anecdotes, turning political morals into a form of experimental physics, and entirely free from any intervention of religion. The book created great excitement and was publicly condemned, inasmuch as the author's attacks on despotism seemed to savor of *lèse-majesté*, and the ethics of self-interest shocked the sentimental altruists of the type of Rousseau. Even Diderot argued against Helvétius and tried to hold his Encyclopedic skirts free from contamination.

Helvétius, the political moralist, owed something to the psychologist Condillac, deriving, like him, ideas from sensation;

much to their common master Locke, both psychologist and moralist; and more or less to Hobbes, La Rochefoucauld, and Fontenelle. These names point to a system of egoism and, indeed, Helvétius's ethics are based on self-interest, and political morals rest on the needs of the general welfare. He thus anticipates modern utilitarianism: Beccaria and Bentham were to a great degree directly indebted to him. But in his own day Helvétius aroused bitter hostility by maintaining that the motives of action rest entirely on self-gratification and pleasure. All virtue, altruism, beneficence, come from selfishness.

Helvétius wrote also a posthumous work, *De l'homme*, which carried on the theories of *De l'esprit* and studied man in the social environment. He maintained that character is influenced by external circumstances; consequently he is led to deal with legislation and education. He goes far enough as a sensationalist to contend that the five senses are equal in men at birth, and that all differences depend on outer forces which may attract or deter them; hence the all-importance of training.

Thus Helvétius is a political moralist, whose altruism rests on an anti-idealistic foundation. As such he not only leads to the English utilitarianism of Mill, but he was in his own country the precursor of the Ideologists, who drew much of their inspiration from his works and from discussions in the *salon* of Mme Helvétius. Helvétius has a more important place than the neglect of his writings seems to imply in the intellectual ancestry of modern French political reformers and social theorists, as the precursor of systems which, since Comte, have been called positivist sociologies.

Julien Offray de la Mettrie (1709–1751), a physician, was one of the first materialists and is known by his theory of the *Homme-machine*. He held that the dualism of mind and body is to be explained from the side of the machine, of which feeling and intellect are but the result. This is a materialistic version of the old scholastic and Aristotelian theories that the soul is the

"form" of the body. The radicalism of La Mettrie's views brought upon him the most violent abuse.

The abbé Guillaume-François Raynal (1713–1796) published, only a few years before the Revolution, an *Histoire philosophique et politique des établissements et du commerce des Européens dans les Deux-Indes*, which undertook to show that the times were out of joint, as well as how to set them right. It was full of miscellaneous and nondescript information, and followed the fashion in vogue of rationalising legends of history and mythology into historical human actions. Though one of the immediate precursors of the revolutionary spirit, he was terrified at the steps then taken, made enemies for himself, and died in poverty.

The baron Paul-Henri-Thiry d'Holbach (1723–1789) was a philosopher of German birth, rich, clever, and worldly, who gave expression to as violent a form of atheism as can be imagined. His most important work, the *Système de la nature*, published in 1770, was too much even for Voltaire and won for its author in later times the name of the "Marat of religion." It is a frank exposition of materialistic views, a Naturalism which was to replace current religion and cosmology. Science is derived from experience, matter lasting from eternity is in constant motion, and acts by laws which we call Chance only when we are not sufficiently acquainted with them. Man is part of the world-mechanism and there is no such thing as free will. The soul disappears when the body dies as a clock ceases to strike when it is broken. God is merely a superficial device of an ignorant and childish theology. An additional feature of the *Système de la nature* was the author's violent assault upon political government, its injustice and cruelty, its hostility to nature.

Charles Pineau Duclos (1704–1772), who began his career by indecent writings and remained indecent in character all his life, became none the less life-secretary of the Academy, historiographer of France, and a general friend of men of importance, yet with sufficient originality and independence to give him a value of his own, even greater than that of his printed books.

His chief works were an *Histoire de Louis XI* and the *Considérations sur les mœurs de ce siècle*, which were called considerations on manners by one who had spent his life in a *café*, with the *Mémoires secrets sur les règnes de Louis XIV et de Louis XV*.

D'Alembert was the illegitimate son of Mme de Tencin,[1] abandoned by her on the steps of the church of Saint-Jean-Lerond soon after his birth in 1717. Left to public charity he was baptised Jean-Baptiste Lerond and brought up by foster parents, though his father, the chevalier Destouches, watched over him and procured his admission to the Collège Mazarin. The source of his name d'Alembert is not known. He was a learned and retiring scholar, fond, above all, of mathematics and natural philosophy. He held high distinctions in learning as member of the Academy of Sciences, as successor of Duclos to the life-secretaryship of the French Academy, as friend of Frederick the Great and of Catherine of Russia. His chief writings, apart from his contributions to the *Encyclopédie* and his eulogies of deceased academicians, were scientific, on refraction, on integral calculus, on the winds. He was the friend of Mme du Deffand, Mme Geoffrin, and Mlle de Lespinasse. This last woman he loved for many years and grieved pathetically for her death. He died in 1783.

Jean-François Marmontel (1723–1799) was educated for the priesthood and was really the abbé de Marmontel, but he grew too liberal and became a professional writer and journalist and editor of the *Mercure*. When the Revolution broke out he seemed too moderate and was denounced by Marat. He wrote numerous plays, valuable memoirs, many articles for the *Encyclopedia* published as the *Eléments de littérature*, pseudo-historical romances such as *Bélisaire* and *les Incas*, and *Contes moraux*. Marmontel is the representative of the Encyclopedists in literature and in popular morals. Like so many of them he believes in the perfectibility of human nature and teaches its improvement by ethical instructions. His romances contain

[1] Cf. p. 462.

dissertations on civilisations and manners, immersed in an artificial narrative-setting, and advocating liberalism in thought and religion and hostility to fanaticism. The stories are told in a mellifluous, at times semi-rhythmic and soporific prose and present almost every conceivable misconception as to the meanings and motives of laws and customs.

The baron Friedrich-Melchior Grimm (1723–1807) was a Gallicised German who became so much at home in his new language as to belong to French literature. He was the friend of Diderot, first the friend and then the foe of Rousseau. He is best known for his *Correspondance littéraire*, covering a period of a great many years, and consisting of periodical reports on the literary, philosophical, and critical events in France. It was sent to foreign rulers desirous of knowing what was happening in the intellectual world, especially the duke of Gotha, whose minister at Paris Grimm was.

The abbé André Morellet (1727–1819) was a free lance of the Encyclopedists and a friend of Voltaire, who called him the abbé *Mords-les* ("bite them"). None of his numberless writings is worth recalling today, but he was in his own time an invaluable recruit of the *philosophes*.

There were several thinkers whose similar theories tended to make them seem to their contemporaries one group having a single aim. These were the Economists, often called the Physiocrats, from the term *Physiocratie* devised by one of them, Dupont de Nemours. The founder of the school was the doctor Quesnay, physician to Mme de Pompadour. His chief tenet was that wealth is all derived from the soil, for commerce and manufactures are sterile and merely transport or transform products without increasing the true riches of a nation. Therefore agriculture should bear the burden of taxation, but it should receive every encouragement as the great source of prosperity to the state. Quesnay wanted an alliance of the monarchy and the peasant classes. The *enfant terrible* of the group was the marquis de Mirabeau, "l'ami des hommes," father of the orator, rich in

incoherent humanitarianism, who pleaded for a greater interest in the cultivation of the soil on the part of the nobility. Quesnay's fellow-economist Gournay is responsible for the phrase so much used by later economists, "laissez faire, laissez passer"; for this school was one of individualists who wished to do away with restrictions upon competition and rivalry, and judged that in absolute liberty only can prosperity be built up. Gournay was not so decided as Quesnay in placing agriculture above manufactures as the source of wealth, and advocated the development of commerce and trade. Many of these thinkers, like Quesnay, believed in a strong government, but that was because they did not trust the wisdom of parliaments and felt that a benevolent despotism could best bring about the necessary improvements. Adam Smith in the *Wealth of Nations* was deeply influenced by the Physiocrats.

The greatest of the Economists was Jacques Turgot (1727–1781), one of the best men of all times. He was educated for the priesthood, but feeling that it would be contrary to his conscience to continue that career, he turned from it and, after holding some legal functions, chiefly as *maître des requêtes*, he was in 1761 sent as *intendant* to the district of Limoges. There for thirteen years he ruled the finances with the greatest wisdom and benevolence. In 1774 he became minister of the new king Louis XVI and tried to put his theories into practice, seeking to improve the financial condition of the government by cutting down expenses. But Turgot had many enemies, chief among whom were the comte de Provence and the queen, whose thoughtless extravagances he opposed; he was also too rigid in applying his theories and suffered from bad health. He retired in disgrace and was replaced by a reactionary régime, but not until he had proved that he desired the regeneration of France. Among the important measures, wise or not, of his rule were the abrogation of the corn laws, the suppression of the *corvée* or obligation to manual labor due to the state, the abolition of the *jurandes* and *maîtrises* or closed guilds and corporations of master-arti-

sans. Thus Turgot gave to France liberty of labor, though he carried the principle of individualism so far as to prohibit the right of association of any kind to employers and workmen.

One of Turgot's earliest works was an address as prior at the Sorbonne, *Sur les progrès successifs de l'esprit humain*, in which he formulates laws of the philosophy of society and the mutual interdependence of its successive ages. In this work he predicted, a generation before the event, the secession of the American colonies. Other important writings were his *Lettres sur la tolérance*, the *Mémoire sur les prêts à l'intérêt et sur l'usure*, and the *Réflexions sur la formation et la distribution des richesses*.

The doctrines of the Physiocrats have perhaps their best literary expression in Condorcet's *Esquisse d'un tableau historique des progrès de l'esprit humain*. The marquis de Condorcet (1743–1794) was an instance of those who, brought up under religious influence, react against it to the extent of virulent hostility. He was a noted mathematician, an admirer and disciple of Voltaire, a follower of Montesquieu's political theories, a friend of Turgot. In the days of the Revolution he ardently tried to lead humanity to a greater degree of happiness. But he was a student rather than a tribune, he lacked the demagogue's art of leadership, and when the Jacobins passed beyond him he was proscribed and obliged to flee. For months he hid in the house of a kindly woman in Paris; then, thinking he had trespassed too long on her kindness, he escaped from her home, was captured by his enemies, and, it is surmised, poisoned himself to avoid a worse fate.

During the months of enforced seclusion, knowing that his enemies were hunting him to put him to death, Condorcet, like Boethius at work on the *Consolation of Philosophy*, spent his time in writing his survey of the perfectibility of the human race. Full of a fervent belief in the amelioration of mankind, he carried the teachings of the Economists, theoretical as with Quesnay or practical as with Turgot, into the sphere of politics and morals. He took the method of Montesquieu and the

conception of Turgot on human progress and threw the idea into futurity, maintaining that even periods of cruelty and barbarism are but incidental and not total obstacles in the onward progress. The advance which mankind was to make, according to Condorcet, was to be grouped under three heads: the destruction of inequality among men, the advance of equality in a given people, the amelioration of man himself.

Thus Condorcet bears a great name among the priests of humanity. Many other leaders of the French Revolution were as convinced as he of the perfectibility of human nature, and what seem to us the atrocious crimes of the Terror were to the Jacobins merely a Cæsarian operation for the safe delivery of the millennium.

The abbé de Mably (1709–1785), an elder brother of Condillac, was the socialist among the *philosophes*, to many of whom he was hostile. The Economists, as individualists and believers in property, were diametrically opposed to him. His fondness for antiquity and his idealisation of ancient Greece and Rome made him see better times in the past than in the future. He was a prophet of woe, not only to his own country, but to the new-born American republic.

Mably's theories varied. In his earlier writings, like the *Parallèle des Romains et des Français*, he believes in a strong monarchy. Later he is the interpreter of socialistic theories ultimately drawn from Plato's *Republic* and *Laws*, and, perhaps unconsciously and much to Rousseau's disgust, influenced by that writer's views. In such works as the *Entretiens de Phocion* and *De la législation* he is the partisan of justice, of equality, advocates the socialistic state, the community of wealth, and would like to see the modern world brought back to the condition of ancient Sparta, or of Sparta as he interprets it.

In spite of the impracticability of Mably's views he became one of the deities of certain revolutionists, particularly in the Jacobin party, and wild demagogues like Marat mouthed the humanitarian platitudes of Mably. Moreover, he and his

fellow-socialist Morelly were the inspirers of Babouvism, the doctrines of François-Noël Babeuf (Gracchus Babeuf), who tried, even after the Thermidorean reaction, to carry to logical conclusions the political, more than economic, socialism of Robespierre. His conspiracy to bring about the establishment of a communistic republic, based on an agrarian law like that of Caius Gracchus and the equal distribution of land, resulted in his execution in 1796.

The culmination of eighteenth-century philosophism may be seen in the almost forgotten, yet characteristic figure of Volney (1757–1820). His family name was Chassebœuf, but his father, objecting to its bucolic connotation, called his son Boisgirais, and the latter afterwards took the name of Volney. He travelled for at least three years in the Orient, through Egypt and Syria, studying the past and the present, and publishing the results in his *Voyage en Egypte et en Syrie*. He took part in the political proceedings of the early Revolution, and in 1791 published the *Ruines, ou Méditations sur les révolutions des empires*. At the moment when old France was dying and a new world was springing up, this work seemed to contain the sum of reflections upon the passage of glory and the evanescence of power. Disheartened at the excesses of the Terror, Volney went to America for a time, but was disappointed in the new republic. Returning to France he grew weary of the struggle and settled down as senator and count of the Empire, opposing only moderately the ideas of Napoleon.

Volney's chief works were the *Ruines* and the *Catéchisme du citoyen français*. The former, permeated with much of the sentimental contemplation of ruins dear to the romantic temperament, aims, however, not merely at passive meditation, but at drawing from the past such lessons as may profit mankind in its progress towards happiness. He finds that the secret of human misfortunes lies in man's ignorance and selfishness, by which he has abandoned natural religion. A state falls into decay when its laws are vicious and its government corrupt, or

when despotism deprives citizens of their liberty and the priestly impostors of religion deceive them by their falsehoods. But, looking forward into the future, Volney foresees the advent of perfect justice, when liberty and equality shall reign, as they were to have done in the Revolution.

Thus Volney has all the humanitarian aspirations of the *philosophes*, the belief of many of them in an ultimate regeneration, their hostility to priests as hypocritical agents of lying religions, their biassed interpretations of the facts of history and their *a priori* generalisations as to the moral order in the future. Ardent, generous, and self-sacrificing to the point of heroism as some of them were, yet their theories, by a curious contrast, are often based on materialistic rather than idealistic foundations, and the extent of altruism to which most of them go is to explain virtue as a form of enlightened self-love.[1]

[1] For a picturesque sketch of an imaginary follower of the *philosophes* in fiction, cf. the character of M. de Lessay in Anatole France's *Crime de Sylvestre Bonnard*.

CHAPTER XII

BUFFON AND SAINT-PIERRE

GEORGES-LOUIS LECLERC (1707–1788), later called comte de Buffon after an estate inherited by the family, was a Burgundian. With the exception of some short periods spent in European travel, his life centred entirely about his studies at his home at Montbard and his duties as director of the Jardin du Roi or Jardin des Plantes in Paris. He devoted himself to his work with the concentration of a Gibbon or sought recreation at the *salon* of Mme Necker. His literary production consisted of the enormous *Histoire naturelle*, the volumes of which stretched from 1749 to the time of his death and included such subjects as the *Théorie de la terre*, the *Histoire naturelle de l'homme*, the *Quadrupèdes*, the *Oiseaux*, the *Minéraux*, and later the *Epoques de la nature*. To this must be added the famous *Discours sur le style*, his address upon admission to the Academy. Buffon had various collaborators, particularly Guéneau de Montbeillard, Daubenton, and the abbé Bexon, upon whom he impressed his ideas and style.

Buffon is the great naturalist and philosopher of nature in the eighteenth century; but, quite in the spirit of the age, he refuses to divorce science from the art of expression. For that reason he has his place among the stylists and men of letters of his time. His true position is that of a literary man trying to write entertainingly, and as accurately as he knew how, on nature. He never neglected what seemed to him the best presentation of his material, and in view of its importance and dignity he adopted a rather ponderous method of expression. But the story of his composing only in full costume with lace cuffs is merely a jest,

and Buffon was, for his day, a thoroughly sound and painstaking student of the natural sciences.

Buffon tried to steer his course midway between preconceived ideas and observation. He had behind him centuries of scholarship, during which the tendency had been to classify by tradition, or by artificial genera dependent on theories of final causes or the perfectibility of man. Being by nature rather the literary man working at natural history than the empirical observer, he often ventures upon conclusions more picturesque than scientific, in which the imagination outran what the facts warranted. Yet Buffon, it must be repeated, was a painstaking student, and his descriptions, accurate or not, bring vivid pictures before the eyes of the layman reading about nature, or portray the unity of plan which Buffon saw extending from man through beasts to inanimate things. In his general views on the world he could sympathise both with the hypotheses of Descartes and the scientific method of Newton, whom he translated, or the psychology of Locke.

Buffon was a man of science so vastly superior to his predecessors, and he hinted at so many ideas which others developed, that his name may still be respected by naturalists, even though his works be valueless. To the student of literature he is important because of his ideas on style and his examples of it in his descriptions of members of individual species. For it is there he best illustrates the "lace-cuff" attitude and supplies what seem to be almost seventeenth-century "characters" or "portraits" applied to the beasts. Thus the lion "a la figure imposante, le regard assuré, la démarche fière, la voix terrible; sa taille n'est point excessive comme celle de l'éléphant ou du rhinocéros; elle n'est ni lourde, comme celle de l'hyène ou de l'ours, ni trop allongée, ni déformée par des inégalités, comme celle du chameau; mais elle est, au contraire, si bien prise et si bien proportionnée, que le corps du lion paraît être le modèle de la force jointe à l'agilité." This is not unlike La Rochefoucauld on himself: "Je suis d'une taille médiocre, libre et bien proportionnée.

J'ai le teint brun, mais assez uni; le front élevé et d'une raisonnable grandeur; les yeux noirs, petits et enfoncés, et les sourcils noirs et épais, mais bien tournés. . . . J'ai quelque chose de chagrin et de fier dans la mine: cela fait croire à la plupart des gens que je suis méprisant, quoique je ne le sois point du tout."

Sometimes Buffon's descriptions verge on *pointes* and preciosity of expression. Thus he writes on the goose:

> Indépendamment de la bonne qualité de sa chair et de sa graisse, dont aucun autre oiseau n'est plus abondamment pourvu, l'oie nous fournit cette plume délicate sur laquelle la mollesse se plaît à reposer, et cette autre plume, instrument de nos pensées, et avec laquelle nous écrivons ici son éloge.

Buffon's writing most valued today is his speech upon election to the Academy, generally known as the *Discours sur le style*, from which is drawn the famous quotation "le style est l'homme même," often misquoted "le style, c'est l'homme." In this address Buffon argues that the style of a writer is what stamps his work with its value and makes it his own. The thoughts with which he deals may be common property; it is by his style that the author is differentiated from others. Thus the skilful writer's ideas will be duly marshalled in effective array, expressed in dignified and noble style, and properly set in motion through accuracy of tone and richness of coloring. Buffon did much to promote the neo-Classic cult of general terms.

Bernardin de Saint-Pierre is today the author of one book alone, yet that was, as so often happens, at first only an incident in his literary career. The author of *Paul et Virginie* was born at Le Havre in 1737. He was not the only eccentric member of a family which included a crazy brother and a morose and misanthropic sister, in the peculiarities of both of whom he at different moments participated. His nature was pre-eminently romantic: in his youth he browsed over the *Lives of the Saints* and dreamed of their distant hermitages and Thebaids, no less than of the remoter desert island where Robinson Crusoe dwelt.

This latter work aroused in the youth a desire to visit the ends of the world, and he took a trip on a relative's vessel to the West Indies, only to return disappointed. His education, when he finally began to take it seriously, was scientific; the result being to warp his poetic visions into a grotesque pseudo-science. He studied engineering and entered military service, but abandoned it before long. Then his roving disposition and his utopian schemes led him to Russia and Poland, in which latter country he was jilted by a lady of title, Marie Miesnik, perhaps with more injury to his vanity than to his heart.

It was not long before he set off in 1767 on an expedition, nominally to establish a new community in Madagascar; but when Saint-Pierre discovered that its real purpose was slave-trading, he deserted at the île de France (Mauritius), where he moped and dreamed for many months. However, the journey was of direct literary value to him in his *Voyage à l'île de France* printed in 1773 when he was thirty-six. Saint-Pierre had now become a rather well-known person, frequenting *salons* like that of Mlle de Lespinasse, or quarrelling with the *philosophes*, but, above all, falling under the permanent influence of Rousseau. With that writer he had many a trait in common, even to morbid suspicion of his fellow-men and temporary insanity. But his friendship with Rousseau inspired a brief study devoted to the master, and he did more than any one else to transmit Rousseau's influence in pure literature. In 1784 appeared the *Etudes de la nature*, which brought the author forward again as the opponent of the materialists and as an advocate of faith in an age of irreligion. To a later edition of this work Bernardin de Saint-Pierre added the episode of *Paul et Virginie*, on which his fame now rests. This was soon followed by the *Vœux d'un solitaire* and the *Chaumière indienne*. The author had now entered into glory: he was worshipped by young women, two of whom, two score or more years younger than himself, he successively married; he was appointed to an official post at the Jardin des Plantes, and lectured at the Normal School. Even during the Revolution

he retained influence. His last important work was the *Harmonies de la nature*. He died in 1814.

Bernardin de Saint-Pierre is not only a disciple of Rousseau, but an ancestor of Romanticism, to which he hands on certain definite characteristics. The love of nature which Rousseau had shown for the scenery of the Alps and the Swiss lakes now manifests itself as an interest in the exotic scenery of the Île de France, with its strange vegetation and unfamiliar birds. When Saint-Pierre was there he spent much of his time in the novel occupation of studying the landscape and taking notes, rather than in devising utopias as the goal of a constant perfectibility, and in his descriptions he mingles everywhere an undercurrent of sensuous emotion which transforms nature into something vibrating in unison with the writer's and spectator's feelings. He had undergone the influence of Gessner's idyls, with their virtuous spouses, meditative and philosophical old men, and dutiful offspring. He had read Ossian and Captain Cook's travels and had combined the windy resonance of the one and the concreteness of the other into accounts of sonorously named flora strange to the French: the *benjoin*, the *colophane*, the *manglier*. To Bernardin de Saint-Pierre the deist, all nature gradually assumed, if not an actual anthropomorphism, at any rate an adaptation to the needs of human beings, with an exaggeration of final causes turning the cosmos into an obsequious *valet de chambre* of man, guided largely by principles of harmonies and contrasts. In his later writings, when the actual memories of his travels had become remote, at the same time that the needs of the lecturer had caused him to smear everything with a veneer of imitation-science, his interpretations of the beneficence of nature become ludicrous: dogs are in color markedly light or dark, so that they may readily be seen in any part of the house, and fleas are brown, so that they may be distinguished on white stockings. Thus Bernardin de Saint-Pierre reads into the universe a poetical interpretation of mechanics, physics, or natural history as full of false analogies

as the word-formulas of the old astronomy or alchemy. The elephant's big head is in æsthetic contrast with his small tail; on the other hand man has a solar harmony because his face is round like the sun. Saint-Pierre was one of the worst instances of the *a priori* generaliser in the realm of sentimental science.

But Saint-Pierre's title to fame rests entirely today on *Paul et Virginie*. This little work, which has caused as many tears to flow as any story written, is the account of two children brought up according to nature amid the remote landscapes of the île de France. Men and women in the dirty European towns were captivated by the descriptions of life in a landscape peopled with cardinal birds and parrots, among heavy-colored and perfume-laden flowers, where "amiable" children played and were fed by their mothers on oranges, pomegranates, bananas, dates and pineapples; women, in particular, were touched by the author's emotional *sensiblerie*, his apostrophes to love and virtue, his dithyrambs on the innocence of a life of nature as opposed to the depravations of society, his threnodies on separation and death. Saint-Pierre's morality is so prurient that his Virginie drowns rather than throw off some of her clothes in a shipwreck; none the less the work was a salutary reaction against the vicious literature of the day. As not unseldom happens, a writer of weak susceptibility to the opposite sex, of a Pecksniffian virtue which made him oppose, as immoral by its cruelty, the phrase suggested to illustrate the word *appartenir* in the dictionary of the Academy, "Il appartient à un père de punir ses enfants," — such a writer became the mentor of a new generation. His deism was even more indeterminate than that of Rousseau; at the same time, his personal touch, his cult of local color, the lulling flow of his sentences, the aromatic melancholy in which the scenes of his story are placed, helped to mould the literature which was to be transformed into Romanticism. By the aid of a long life, wherein age and a partial and biassed biographer enabled the selfishness, fortune-hunting,

vanity, moroseness, and morbidness to be forgotten, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre became to succeeding generations the advocate of righteousness, the lecturer on morals at the Normal School, and the writer over whose idyl people shed tears of "sensibility." Under the influence of authors such as Saint-Pierre, Florian, or Berquin people wept as naturally as they ate and drank.

CHAPTER XIII

EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY POETRY

THERE is plenty of poetry so-called in the eighteenth century, yet little of it deserves to survive. It was either a drawing-room ornament and weapon for success, a vehicle for smartness or sentimentality, a form of wit in the shape of epigrams, versified stories, and madrigals, or else the means of expounding topics apparently most foreign to poetry, in the form of didactic or descriptive treatises. The vocabulary and expression are essentially flat; the rhymes are barely sufficient; the words, except in the odes where certain "Pindaric" innovations are attempted, are not distinguishable from prose; the topics treated, at any rate in a long poem, would be better placed in a work of erudition.

The art of the eighteenth century gives one a good idea of much of the poetry: there were many frills and furbelows, smirks and quirks, but poetry, set forth in dainty books with vignettes and *culs-de-lampe*, was as untrue to life as the *Embarquement pour Cythère* of Watteau. Even the epicureanism of loves and roses was without the passion of the sixteenth-century anacreontic poetry, but belonged to the age of boudoirs and of powder, paint, and patches, of Boucher and Vanloo. The favorite poet of the poets was Ovid, and temples of love or friendship, built in flowery parks overlooking silver lakes, were in the pages of the versifiers the scene of joys quickly fading and soon renewed; for constancy was not the poet's ideal. It was only as the century advanced and people tired of the sameness of this poetry that sentiment reappeared here as elsewhere. The cloying virtue of Salomon Gessner's Theocritean idyls of

nature in Switzerland and Germany had their effect. There came, too, melancholy, a counterpart of the tearfulness of the *comédie larmoyante*. It was encouraged by the brooding literature of England, some of which was translated, Young's *Night Thoughts* and James Hervey's *Meditations among the Tombs*, both translated by Le Tourneur, or Pope's *Eloisa to Abelard*, adapted by Feutry and Colardeau:

> In these deep solitudes and awful cells,
> Where heav'nly-pensive Contemplation dwells,
> And ever-musing Melancholy reigns,
> What means this tumult in a vestal's veins?

Thus poetry gradually took up and used for years new topics of loneliness, gloom, ruins, deserted monasteries, and the stage-setting of the later "bas romantisme" was gradually evolved. But Romanticism swept away the empty lyrics and Gessner-idyls which had outserved their time, just as it overthrew a decadent tragedy.

How little poetry at the beginning of the century meant to some poets themselves may be seen in the theories of a typical man of letters of the early period, Houdar de la Motte (1672–1731), already mentioned as the friend of Mme de Lambert. He was considered a philosopher and universal wit, and dabbled in all kinds of literature with equally indifferent superiority. The "philosophers" had not yet become specialists in systematic scepticism, and La Motte was merely a clever literary critic and a passable writer. Like the others, he sniffed at authority and tested all doctrines with an assumption of open-mindedness often carried to the point of paradox for the sake of being different. But preachings were apt to be bolder than practice.

To poetry La Motte gave little other purpose than to be agreeable, perhaps an entertainment for ladies, though he considered it a vehicle for the manifestations of reason. It had no place for the emotions, inasmuch as the chief element of taste was the critical faculty. Later in life he went so far as to pro-

claim the futility of poetry and versification and the *invraisemblance* of poetical imagery. Carrying further the argument that a tragedy may be in prose and yet be a tragedy, he attacked the tyranny of rhyme in general and composed *la Libre éloquence*, "ode en prose."

In the quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns, La Motte naturally sided with the latter. Subservience to the authors of antiquity meant to him abdication of the rights of reason and of the privilege of emulation in the place of servile imitation (La Motte wrote an ode on *Emulation*), as well as the denial of intellectual progress.

Preserving this attitude of the mild literary revolutionist, La Motte argued that poetry should open its arms to the sciences, mental, moral, and natural, as manifestations of reason. As contributions of his own to poetry, apart from some anæmic tragedies, he wrote odes in the style of Boileau, with the same conventions of rhetoric and vocabulary that appeared in all determined imitations of the Pindaric frenzy. He wrote numberless verse-trifles, forms of *poésie légère*, and eclogues as examples of what he called "élégance champêtre":

> Sur la fin d'un beau jour, rassemblés sous des hêtres,
> Des bergers s'amusaient à des discours champêtres;
> Quelques belles entre eux se mêlant à leur tour,
> L'entretien fut plus vif et tourna sur l'amour:
> *Tous les autres sujets et les plus étrangers*
> *Conduisent là bientôt, et surtout des bergers.*

La Motte was the author also of fables, artificial and wooden in character, often the personification of abstract terms like Imagination and Memory. But the worst of his productions was probably his remodelling of the *Iliad*, abridged to twelve cantos and brought down to the taste of the period.

La Motte's chief rival and foe was Jean-Baptiste Rousseau (1670–1741), exiled from France for a literary scandal of which he may have been innocent, who soared even more vigorously

than his master Boileau in the latter's ode on the capture of Namur. He wrote sacred odes, or profane ones full of mythology applied to modern events, lyric cantatas, epigrams of which not the least bitter were directed against La Motte. Yet it must be said that Rousseau was probably the best lyric poet of the century before Chénier.

Louis Racine (1692–1763) came out of due time and in many respects he belonged more to the seventeenth century than to the eighteenth. Born as his father, the great Racine, was passing from middle to old age, and brought up among the influences of Jansenism and the Oratoire, he remained all his life solemn and unable to mix with his fellow-men. Most of his poetry was too religious for his age, and his poems *la Grâce* and *la Religion*, permeated with Saint Augustine, Pascal, Bossuet, and Malebranche, could not be popular. Even the philosophical passages of his verse were to the public taste vitiated by their religion. Louis Racine's lyric poetry, including his sacred odes, was insignificant, but his chief prose writings, the memoirs of his father, the criticisms of his plays, the studies of poetry and the drama, all have value.

Jean-Jacques Le Franc, marquis de Pompignan (1709–1784), had the misfortune to arouse the hostility of Voltaire and was buried beneath the satire of the philosophers. He was, however, the best lyric poet between Jean-Baptiste Rousseau and Chénier. Le Franc de Pompignan wrote *Poésies sacrées* based on the Psalms, which have dignity and force, some odes, including one on the death of J.-B. Rousseau, and a couple of tragedies, of which *Didon* alone has been preserved.

Clinchamp de Malfilâtre (1733–1767) is best remembered today by Gilbert's line, "La faim mit au tombeau Malfilâtre ignoré," which is, however, not to be taken literally. He was a good writer, a lover of antiquity, but quite devoid of initiative and hence neglected even in his own day. He tried descriptive and classical poetry, including translations, particularly *Narcisse dans l'île de Vénus*.

Nicolas-Joseph-Laurent Gilbert (1751–1780) is usually mentioned in connection with Malfilâtre, whom he resembled at least in the brevity and misfortunes of his life. He has also often been compared to Chatterton, though the story of his death from privation has no real foundation and is chiefly due to his own famous verses:

> Au banquet de la vie, infortuné convive,
> J'apparus un jour, et je meurs:
> Je meurs et sur ma tombe, où lentement j'arrive,
> Nul ne viendra verser des pleurs.

Gilbert lives by the ode from which these lines are drawn, the whole of which is pervaded with a gentle melancholy that nineteenth-century lyric writers like Lamartine or Musset have not surpassed, and by two vigorous satires, one of which, *le Dix-huitième siècle*, is the best possible take-off of his own times. Gilbert is one of the true poets of his age and would be rated higher were his literary baggage greater.

Charles-Pierre Colardeau (1732–1776), though almost entirely forgotten today, is important as a transmitter of the English influences and by his share in developing in modern France three things: the *héroïde*, imaginary verse-letters, a form ultimately ascending to Ovid and renewed in the eighteenth century by the adaptation of Pope's epistle and the vogue of letters in the prose romances; descriptive or technical poetry, which as yet had hardly been written, except by Louis Racine, but was destined to have such popularity; and the idyl or eclogue, also destined to have great prominence again in poets like Chénier. Colardeau put sentiment into verse and was one of the few of his immediate time to do so.

The chevalier Claude-Joseph Dorat (1734–1780) is the model of the eighteenth-century light poet, of the type whose works still remain in graceful editions with illustrations by Eisen or Marillier. He was a musketeer, had the usual disputes with Voltaire, wrote insignificant tragedies and comedies, tried to

edit a paper called the *Journal des dames*, and died in poverty. His reputation rests, however, not on these, but on his trifles: heroids of the kind introduced by his friend Colardeau, epistles and stories in verse, didactic poetry and satires, and, last but not least, the *Baisers*, adaptations of the *Basia* of the Dutch Latin poet Secundus, and epigrammatic fables:

Usant de tout, je ne hais rien,
Pas même le don de la vie,
Qui n'est pas le souverain bien.
Je chéris un tendre lien,
L'amour vrai, l'amitié discrète,
Et j'aime mieux dans ma retraite,
Badiner comme Lucien,
Que de gémir comme Epictète.

Pierre-Joseph Bernard (1708–1775) received the epithet of "gentil" from Voltaire and is always called Gentil-Bernard. He was a drawing-room poet, prosperous in money matters and mediocre in ability, spending his time, says Marmontel, in calling one lady Hebe, another Flora, and a third a nymph or one of the Graces. His deity was Ovid and, in addition to miscellaneous verse and an opera, *Castor et Pollux*, he wrote an *Art d'aimer* in three cantos and a story in verse of *Phrosine et Mélidore*.

The chevalier Stanislas de Boufflers (1738–1815), after an adventurous life, settled down in old age to be a prim librarian. It was Boufflers's poetry that Chamfort called "meringues and whipped cream."

CHAPTER XIV

EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY POETRY (CONTINUED).

AS the eighteenth century progressed, certain tendencies already pointed out increased. On the one hand the light and trifling poetry continued in vogue and the poetasters revelled more than ever in epigrams. On the other hand there was a greater production than before of the learned didactic and descriptive poems by authors such as Delille, Saint-Lambert, and Roucher. This was partly increased by the desire of critics to harmonise the underlying principles of art and literature, and by the confusion of description and narration. Finally, there is an awakening of sentiment and emotion.

Examples of the didacticism are to be found in travesties of Thomson's *Seasons*, the *Mois* of Roucher, or the *Saisons* of Saint-Lambert, of whom Gilbert wrote:

> Saint-Lambert, noble auteur, dont la muse pédante
> Fait des vers fort vantés par Voltaire qu'il vante.

But the most noteworthy writer was the abbé Jacques Delille (1738–1813), who, though a layman and unhappy in marriage, held his title from a clerical living. He is the climax of unadulterated pseudo-Classicism and the glorification of its methods. His death threw the French nation into mourning; his body lay in state for three days, and his funeral might be compared with those of Voltaire or Hugo. Today hardly a person in a hundred thousand has read through one of the important poems of Delille.

He began his career by a translation of Virgil's *Georgics*, which,

on the recommendation of Voltaire, won him an election to the French Academy and a professorship at the Collège de France. There followed other agricultural poems in an urban style, a "style citadin" as Rivarol called it, *les Jardins; l'Homme des champs; les Trois règnes de la nature;* as well as translations of the *Æneid* and *Paradise Lost* and "intellectual" poems, *l'Imagination* and *la Conversation*, which are on the whole better, inasmuch as a city man is more at home in describing social life or versifying La Bruyère than in explaining a nature which he knows only through Buffon.

The one thing for which Delille is now remembered is his proneness to periphrasis. His poetry consists mainly of enumeration and descriptions, and he adopts everywhere elegant and flowing circumlocutions almost as roundabout as the terms of preciosity. Pseudo-Classicism had definitely abolished the specific and the concrete. So the French equivalent for the "cup that cheers but does not inebriate" is:

> Le feuillage chinois, par un plus doux succès,
> De nos dîners tardifs corrige les excès,
> Et, faisant chaque soir sa ronde accoutumée,
> D'une chère indigeste apaise la fumée.

All this was the delight of his contemporaries. When Delille wrote of the scenes of his childhood, in the tone of the *Old Oaken Bucket*,

> C'est ici que Zéphyr de sa jalouse haleine
> Effaçait mes palais dessinés sur l'arène;
> C'est là que le caillou, lancé dans le ruisseau,
> Glissait, sautait, glissait et sautait de nouveau.
> Un rien m'intéressait; mais avec quelle ivresse
> J'embrassais, je baignais de larmes de tendresse,
> Le vieillard qui jadis guida mes pas tremblants,
> La femme dont le lait nourrit mes premiers ans,
> Et le sage pasteur qui forma mon enfance!
> Souvent je m'écriais: Témoins de ma naissance,
> Témoins de mes beaux jours, de mes premiers désirs,
> Beaux lieux, qu'avez-vous fait de mes premiers plaisirs?

the editor of a contemporary edition (1802) exclaims: "Je plains le lecteur à qui il n'échappe pas une larme à la lecture de ces vers."

The new sentimentalism in poetry shows itself in Parny and Bertin, both of them natives of the distant île Bourbon in the Indian Ocean.[1] Evariste de Parny (1753–1814) wrote chiefly *poésies érotiques* in a soft and lazy tone which is something like a Lamartine before his time, and with an Eléonore to Lamartine's Elvire. The other works of this "Tibulle français" were worthless. He had all the irreverence and unbelief, and some of the indecency of his age, but his voluptuous lyric verse makes him a distant precursor of the new Renaissance.

Antoine de Bertin (1752–1790) was a friend of Parny, with whom he had much in common. There was something more of the feeling for nature in his verse than in that of his fellow-Creole.

The climax of emotionalism is reached towards the end of the century, even when the horrible cruelties of the Revolution were being perpetrated. This came not only from Rousseau and Diderot, but also from Gessner, who in England had his effect as well on Cowper, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Byron. Gessner by his *Death of Abel* inspired the literature of remorse; by his rustic idyls he renewed the fondness for prose and verse pastorals, transforming the love-motive of previous eclogues into the moral emotions. The subjects, immersed in the sticky sentimentality of German molasses-literature, fell in with the prevailing fashions of Rousseau-rusticity,[2] and the country became the home of purity, inhabited by virtuous shepherds and benevolent sages. We get different phases of these literary tendencies in manifestations ranging from what Horace Walpole

[1] This was an age of exotic poets, Parny, Bertin, Léonard, Chénier; a phenomenon repeated a hundred years later in Heredia, Moréas, Viélé-Griffin, Stuart Merrill, etc.

[2] The pastoralism of Gessner and the nature-absorption of Rousseau must, however, carefully be distinguished.

called the "encyclopedic Arcadia" of Saint-Lambert's *Saisons* to the revivals of Arcadia in real life in the hamlet and lake of Marie-Antoinette's Petit-Trianon. And the dwellers in these Arcadias were of the tearful type, wearing dresses "en soupirs étouffés," trimmed with "regrets superflus" and "plaintes indiscrètes."

The idyls of Gessner were not only translated, but inspired the idyls of Nicolas-Germain Léonard (1744–1793), who was born in Guadeloupe in the West Indies, and those of Arnaud Berquin (1749–1791), whose name has produced the word *berquinade*, to express an insipid and goody-goody kind of literature. A vastly better writer than these was Florian.

The chevalier de Florian (1755–1794), half Spanish and a protégé of Voltaire and of the pious duc de Penthièvre, served for a time in the army, but is much more important as a man of letters in comedy and romance. Today he is chiefly remembered by his fables. His novels *Numa Pompilius*, *Gonzalve de Cordoue*, and especially the more purely pastoral ones, *Galatée* and *Estelle*, are a last effulgence of the old sentiment of the *Astrée* combined with Spanish plots and the new Gessnerism. Estelle and Némorin are perfect lovers, like Astrée and Céladon, and wander through fanciful landscapes in a Dresden china world. It is very pretty, but there is too much of it, and one can but be amused at Lebrun-Pindare's epigram on Florian:

> Dans ton beau roman pastoral,
> Avec tes moutons pêle-mêle,
> Sur un ton bien doux, bien moral,
> Berger, bergère, auteur, tout bête.

Only praise can be bestowed on Florian's fables, which rank above any others in French literature since those of La Fontaine. It must not be forgotten that fable literature was produced in abundance during the eighteenth century by Dorat, Colardeau, Piron, and many others. Every man of letters aspired to write a successful tragedy, a comedy *contes*, and fables. Those of

Florian, partly original, partly imitated from the Spanish, verge on the *conte moralisé*. They belong to what we call the Sunday-school type, and have much of the "How-big-was-Alexander-Pa?" air about them. Like La Fontaine's fables they are inspired by the observation of contemporary society, but it is in order to show the advantage of virtue, the blessings of mediocrity, the sin of vanity, selfishness, and irreflection. To the casual reader, Florian's fables are often indistinguishable from those of La Fontaine.

It is particularly interesting to note that in the last decades of the eighteenth century, when pseudo-Classicism has run its course, there comes a reaction towards real antiquity, a return towards true sources of inspiration in the past. This period forms an interlude between the days of Classicism and of Romanticism, and includes the Revolution and the reign of Napoleon I. At certain moments the three schools, old, middle, and new, are contemporary rivals, and some authors may be classed from different standpoints in more than one school. But generally false antiquity stands in opposition to the real.

Many things contributed to make antiquity fashionable. We have enumerated the tendencies proceeding from Rousseau, together with the influences of the historical writings of Montesquieu, Rollin, and Mably, and the academic eulogies of the now forgotten rhetorician Thomas. Then acquaintance with the remains of the ancients had actually increased. In the second half of the century, the excavations of Pompeii and Herculaneum were begun, the comte de Caylus published his *Recueil d'antiquités*, and the abbé Barthélemy his *Voyage du jeune Anacharsis en Grèce*, which had occupied thirty years of his life. It purported to be the narrative of the travels of a young Scythian through the civilised Hellenic world, and included in its pages all the learning of the age concerning the social life of the ancients. Unfortunately the erudition of the late eighteenth century was usually wasted in small details and lacked any true appreciative synthesis. Meanwhile poets and scholars were interested in

Brunck's anthology of the Alexandrian poets. German critics like Winckelmann had turned the art of the ancients into a new conception for the modern world, and the operas of Gluck seemed to open a vision of antique beauty and harmony which appeared to many to be Greek tragedy in its majesty and simple dignity. In French art this return towards antiquity found expression in the works of Vien and of David, with his *Serment des Horaces* modernised in his *Serment du Jeu de Paume*. Architecture reproduced the temples and buildings of Greece and Rome, women wore flimsy Greek costumes, and the authorities fostered games and sports, parades and festivals, which mark the scenic side of the Revolution.

Lebrun was in poetry one of the representatives of the movement towards antiquity, but the only author of genius was Chénier.

André Chénier, son of a French father and of a Greek mother, and first cousin once removed of Adolphe Thiers, was born at Constantinople in 1762, and was guillotined at the age of thirty-two, with his fellow-poet Roucher among twenty-six others, under the Terror in 1794, two days before the fall of Robespierre. He served in the army, travelled much, though he never saw Greece, lived the wild society life of his day with many love affairs, and spent several unhappy years as secretary of the French legation in London. During the Revolution he took part in politics as a member of the Société des amis de la Constitution, opposing the violences of the advanced parties, and, before his execution, undergoing several months' imprisonment at Saint-Lazare, where he wrote some of his most enduring verse.

Chénier's poems have come down to us in the most incomplete manner. Hardly one of his works was finished and published at his death. What he did give forth, as the ode on the *Jeu de Paume* and the fierce *Hymne sur l'entrée triomphale des Suisses*, gave little hint of Chénier's originality in its traditional "Pindarism." Nearly everything remained incomplete in portfolios, sometimes merely as fragments of two or three lines, suggestions

and hints for development, or as passages to be inserted in other works. It was not until 1819 that his writings became known to the public, and then only in a somewhat garbled version by a "literary" editor, H. de Latouche. Later editions by Becq de Fouquières and Gabriel de Chénier have increased variety rather than unity.[1]

André Chénier has often seemed a problem in literary history and has been variously classed as a Classicist or a precursor of Romanticism. He belonged precisely to the transition age, when any originality could be twisted into different interpretations; consequently, writers like Sainte-Beuve, on the quest for eponymous heroes to Romanticism, made much of Chénier. On the other hand he exhibits almost every tendency of his age. Perhaps it is more true to call Chénier a Classicist of the type of the sixteenth-century humanists. Chénier presents some remarkable coincidences with Ronsard, though he did not like him, and though he did not, as Ronsard, have the good fortune to found a school. Moreover, if Ronsard was great enough to seem both a Classicist and a Romanticist, the same may be said of Chénier. Both were steeped in ancient learning, their interests were much in the same fields of literature, and their theories were in many respects similar. Chénier did not, like Ronsard, try to develop a new poetic vocabulary, but we occasionally find in him a Ronsardian compound. Of both it may be said that only the possession of classical culture can enable one to appreciate them to the full.

The theory of the Pléiade expressed in the *Défense* was, as has already been pointed out in the chapter on the sixteenth-century

[1] It is useless to worry over the incompleteness of Chénier's works. A poet who at thirty-two had written so many fragments and completed so little would have gone on doing precisely the same thing through a long life:

> Moi, je suis ce fondeur: de mes écrits en foule
> Je prépare longtemps et la forme et le moule;
> Puis, sur tous à la fois je fais couler l'airain:
> Rien n'est fait aujourd'hui, tout sera fait demain.

school, identical with Chénier's early views concerning imitation or assimilation:

> Ami, Phœbus ainsi me verse ses largesses;
> Souvent des vieux auteurs j'envahis les richesses.
> Plus souvent leurs écrits, aiguillons généreux,
> M'embrasent de leurs flammes, et je crée avec eux.

Nor is it wise to go as far as M. Faguet in his monograph on Chénier and infer that Chénier's later attitude, "Sur des pensers nouveaux faisons des vers antiques," carries one further away from Ronsard, inasmuch as that poet's Petrarchism was in his day certainly trying to make use of "des pensers nouveaux."[1]

Chénier, by sentiment or, as people have said, by atavism, was a Greek, though with results Hellenistic rather than Hellenic, and in many respects modern. The classical taste is visible, not only by the allusions in his poems, but by the copiousness of his annotations, which remind one of a Muret commenting the *Amours de Cassandre*. Yet Chénier appreciates more the Alexandrian and diminutive side of antiquity than its grander phases. The Theocritean eclogue, the idyl, or among the Romans Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, mean more after all to him than Homer, Virgil, or Lucretius, however much he may borrow from the greater writers. He had studied all writers from Æschylus to the Latin poets of the Renaissance, but it is easy to see which appealed to him most. One need only turn over at random Chénier's elegies and *bucoliques* to come upon line after line recalling Theocritus and the Greek and Latin lyric

[1] Chénier's views of Invention,

> Et sans suivre leurs pas, imiter leur exemple,
> Faire en s'éloignant d'eux avec un soin jaloux,
> Ce qu'eux-mêmes ils feraient s'ils vivaient parmi nous,

carry beyond the bounds of Du Bellay's *Défense* the boldness of novelty. But the result, in Chénier as in Ronsard, was often crazy-quilt patchwork. Chénier was on the lookout for passages to copy. In a note to *l'Amérique* he says: "Quand j'aurai lu son poème je verrai s'il y a quelque chose à traduire."

poets. He had a vividness that other poets of his time had not, but with sometimes a finical touch, which on the one hand betokens the accurate scholar, on the other the literary Alexandrian. Take, for instance, one of the most famous of Chénier's poems, the *Jeune Tarentine*, suggested to him by a funeral epigram in the Greek *Anthology* by Xenocritus of Rhodes, in which the melody of Hellenic names, the allusions to mythology and ancient rites are united in a harmony that Ronsard never excelled:

> Elle est au sein des flots, la jeune Tarentine;
> Son beau corps a roulé sous la vague marine.
> Téthis, les yeux en pleurs, dans le creux d'un rocher
> Aux monstres dévorants eut soin de le cacher.
> Par son ordre bientôt les belles Néréides
> L'élèvent au-dessus des demeures humides,
> Le portent au rivage, et dans ce monument
> L'ont, au cap du Zéphyr, déposé mollement.
> Puis de loin à grands cris appelant leurs compagnes,
> Et les nymphes des bois, des sources, des montagnes,
> Toutes, frappant leur sein et traînant un long deuil,
> Répétèrent: "Hélas!" autour de son cercueil.

Such was the influence of antiquity in Chénier; but he had another strain which showed him a resultant of the influences of his time. The lackadaisical emotionality of Gessnerism is to be found in Chénier as much as in Parny or Bertin, though sometimes veiled by the antique setting. The "pathetic fallacy" of nature (a nature usually known through books), the pleasure of tears are all in Chénier. He already has some of the morbidness of Romanticism, without its egotism. He had, too, the licentious strain of his time, and planned, like Ovid, an *Art of Love*. Though he died young, he never went to Heaven wearing the white flower of a blameless life either in his existence or his poetry. His untranslatable Greek verses written in London prove this.

Chénier most clearly combines the tendencies of Alexandrinism and of the eighteenth century in *l'Invention*, and particu-

larly the fragmentary *Amérique* and *Hermès*. The poets of the Ptolemies were fond of didactic treatises, and we have already noticed the numerous poeticised treatises of the eighteenth century. The *Hermès* was to have been a cosmological epic, composed by a follower of Buffon and the Encyclopedists.

Towards the end of his short career, Chénier awoke from his dreams and took his part in attacking the crimes of the Revolution. Like Ronsard in the *Discours sur les misères du temps* he felt called on to cry out in the wilderness, even though it brought him into opposition to his own brother, Marie-Joseph. But the fierceness of his *Iambes*, such as the poem signed "Archiloque Mastigophore," outdoes in violence the rhetoric of Ronsard. It is to the experiences of his imprisonment that we owe the poem looked upon as the summing-up of his genius, the ode *la Jeune captive*, which expresses the favorite topic, the pathos of early death. Here is the dignity without the stiltedness of Malherbe's *Stances à Du Périer*, the melancholy which would have made Gilbert the great poet of his generation, the rich harvest drawn from antiquity, without the erudition which make the poems of a humanist unintelligible to one not educated in the classics:

Mon beau voyage encore est si loin de sa fin!
Je pars, et des ormeaux qui bordent le chemin
  J'ai passé les premiers à peine.
Au banquet de la vie à peine commencé,
Un instant seulement mes lèvres ont pressé
  La coupe en mes mains encore pleine.

Je ne suis qu'au printemps, je veux voir la moisson;
Et comme le soleil, de saison en saison,
  Je veux achever mon année.
Brillante sur ma tige et l'honneur du jardin,
Je n'ai vu luire encor que les feux du matin,
  Je veux achever ma journée.

In the days of civil strife, Ecouchard Lebrun or Lebrun-Pindare (1729–1807) attempted to soar on waxen wing and wrote odes in the grand style in honor of Voltaire, Buffon,

the old régime, the Revolution, and Napoleon. His "beau désordre" pleased better writers and influenced Chénier. But Lebrun had not the temperament of a Pindar or a Tyrtæus: his life was sordid and disgraceful, and his mean temperament found vent in spiteful epigrams. "Lebrun," wrote a contemporary, "squatting in bed with dirty sheets and a dirty shirt, surrounded by Virgil, Horace, Corneille, Racine, and Rousseau, and fishing for words from the one and then another to compose verses which are but a mosaic."

It was only in two odes that French revolutionary Pindarism reached the pitch that stirs men's souls. The one was the dithyrambic *Chant du départ* by Marie-Joseph Chénier, the other the world-famous *Marseillaise* by Rouget de Lisle; and even this latter poem owes much of its success to the tune. The language is turgid and the figures of speech verge on fustian.

The consumptive poet Charles Millevoye (1782–1816) may be called a transition writer between the eighteenth-century sentimentalists and the nineteenth-century Romanticists. He was influenced in his elegies by Chénier, and in turn influenced Lamartine. He tried multifarious composition: translations, elegiac, didactic, satiric, and heroic poems, and cultivated forms of the ballad or *romance*, a sentimental lyric passage verging on song. His expression of melancholy and premature death as found in his most famous poems, the *Chute des feuilles* and the *Poète mourant*, pleased the lyric writers of the succeeding generation. His fondness for the Middle Ages and his mediæval ballads were akin to what is known as the *genre troubadour*, and also harmonised with the cult of the Middle Ages among the Romanticists.

CHAPTER XV

BEAUMARCHAIS. THE COMING OF THE REVOLUTION

THE flower of eighteenth-century comedy is found in the two most famous works of Beaumarchais. This strange character is an embodiment of the new spirit of the age and a precursor of the Revolution and the revendication of the rights of man. At the same time he is an excellent example of the *parvenu*, the *arriviste*, not without something of the adventurer or *picaro*.

Pierre-Augustin Caron, born in 1732, was the son of a watchmaker and for some years practised that trade himself. He had great mechanical skill, and some clever devices, including a diminutive watch for Mme de Pompadour, gained him admission to Versailles. There his musical talents and improvements to the harp charmed the daughters of Louis XV. By lucky marriages with two widows and by a tactful service to the financier Paris-Duverney, he found chances for successful speculation. As he became wealthy, he tried to rise in the social scale by the purchase of official posts, just as he had already assumed the name of Beaumarchais. There was always in Beaumarchais something of the *nouveau riche* judging rank in terms of money: "Nobody," said he, "can deny my noble rank, because I hold a receipt for it."

Beaumarchais became a restless participant in every activity and was always drawn to novelty, whether in literature, mechanics, or commerce. He had the knack of acting at the spectacular moment and of getting himself talked about. An experience in Spain, where he went partly to protect a sister betrayed by Clavijo, gave rise to plays on Clavijo, including that of Goethe;

by secret missions to England to buy off blackmailers of Mme du Barry and by inventing heroic and romantic adventures in the government service in Germany he strengthened his position with the authorities. He fought successfully for author's rights and remuneration against the encroachments of the actors of the Comédie-Française. By serving as an intermediary between the French government and the American insurgents for the furnishing of supplies under the firm-name of Rodrigue Hortalez and Company, he built up a vast fleet of ships, almost a private navy, of which one vessel, the *Fier Rodrigue*, actually took part in a naval battle. But in these American transactions Beaumarchais made a far from profitable venture, and only in 1835 his family received from the United States government 800,000 francs for claims which in 1793 had been acknowledged for 2,280,000. "Date obolum Belisario," he wrote in his later poverty-stricken days. His enthusiasm also led him to sink thousands in a vast and unremunerative edition of Voltaire, published at Kehl. Voltaire's works could not be issued then in France, though they were admitted with the connivance of the authorities.

Thus Beaumarchais had his tribulations and hardships: his enemies accused him of poisoning his first two wives, he had unpleasant law suits and squabbles with the comte de la Blache, nephew and heir of Paris-Duverney, and the duc de Chaulnes who had insulted him, which quarrels caused his imprisonment. He had to struggle against King Louis XVI himself in behalf of the *Mariage de Figaro*, and his enemies banded together to destroy his triumphs by satires and epigrams or by actual violence. He had troubles with Mirabeau, and by his interference in the matrimonial disagreements of the Kornman family he gave a chance to the tricky lawyer Bergasse to injure his standing. Finally, at the time of the Revolution he was accused of duplicity in transactions connected with the purchase of guns, and during his absence from France on public service his property was confiscated, his third wife imprisoned, and he was classed

among the *émigrés*. He underwent poverty during his exile, but when he died in 1799, after his return to France, he still had a considerable fortune.

This long biography of Beaumarchais is necessary because his dramatic hero Figaro is in many respects the embodiment of his own character. The plays of Beaumarchais are, indeed, not his only literary work, nor do they always have an unbroken success. In 1773, as an offshoot of his quarrel with the comte de la Blache, Beaumarchais, temporarily imprisoned during his dispute with the duc de Chaulnes, became involved in one with the conseiller Goëzman, agent of the hostile chancellor Maupeou, who was intrusted with the drawing up of a report on the case. Beaumarchais accused Mme Goëzman of retaining part of a bribe which he had sent in order to have judgment given in his favor. The matter was an unsavory one, but it took on a larger political aspect as a contest between partisans and foes of Maupeou, and Beaumarchais received the help of many friends. For the same political reasons the outcome of the case struck both the Goëzmans and Beaumarchais with official censure, but he put the laughers on his side by his *Mémoires:* by his irony and wit, by his caricatures he made his enemies the laughing-stock of France. Though the distance is remote, these writings have been compared to the *Provinciales* of Pascal.

But it is as a dramatist that Beaumarchais marks an epoch, though some of his plays have now merely historical importance. He follows Diderot in the composition of the emotional play scattered with dissertations and discussions, and the theory of which he repeated after Diderot in his *Essai sur le genre dramatique sérieux*. His *Eugénie* (1767), of which the scene was first placed in France and then transferred to England to avoid wounding susceptibilities, deals with the story of wronged innocence and introduces the stock character of the noble deceiver. "Cet ouvrage," said Beaumarchais, "*enfant de ma sensibilité*, respire l'amour de la vertu et ne tend qu'à épurer notre théâtre et en faire une école de bonnes mœurs." Similarly *les Deux*

amis (1770) has a plot involving a question of honor carried to the point of absurdity. Toward the end of his life he brought out a mediocre "philosophical" and political opera *Tarare* (1787), though it was really written much earlier, and in 1792 his drama *la Mère coupable* had a vogue which outlived the author. But his great successes were the *Barbier de Séville* (1775) and the *Mariage de Figaro* (1783). In his plays Beaumarchais, seeking "le naturel," carried the minutiæ of stage directions and stage settings to extremes, in the dramas particularly by various *jeux d'entr'acte* in dumb show. He would often group a stage scene with its actors after a famous picture.

Beaumarchais first wrote the *Barbier* as a *parade*, then as a comic opera for the Italian actors, interspersed with *tonadillas* or interludes in song, the taste for which he had acquired in his Spanish trip. They refused it, whereupon he rewrote it as a comedy, but it was only after further modifications that it won success. The plot is the familiar one of the young girl, the doting guardian, the dashing lover, and the resourceful rogue, here a barber, who helps to trick the old man.

The *Barbier de Séville* enriched French drama with the character of Figaro. In many respects he is the counterpart of the tricky valet Mascarille of Molière's *Etourdi*, with much of the *gracioso* and the *picaro*. But in reality Figaro is Beaumarchais, in his wit, his good-nature, his trickiness, his outpouring of spirit in song, his boldness of speech. He has the *gaminerie* of the Frenchman at sport, making fun of all that is held in veneration. Rosine, the heroine, is no mere *ingénue*, but quite willing to trick her suspicious guardian Bartholo. Count Almaviva is the gay lover; the hypocrite don Basile is the butt of the play: "Qui diable est-ce donc qu'on trompe ici? Tout le monde est dans le secret!" he plaintively asks when he is himself the victim.

In the *Folle journée, ou le Mariage de Figaro*, Figaro has imbibed the new revolutionary spirit. Count Almaviva, married to Rosine, neglects her and longs for the soubrette Suzanne whom Figaro intends to marry. The whole play is one of mad

intrigue, filled with surprises, disguises, and night concealments, with puns, philosophical disquisitions, song, and bitter sarcasm. Of this the long monologue in the fifth act is an instance. Figaro, instead of being as in the previous play the agent of the count, now fights for himself against Almaviva and embodies the spirit of the people face to face with the *noblesse*. Instead of being a light-hearted adventurer, Figaro is now a *philosophe:* "Qu'avez-vous fait pour tant de biens? Vous vous êtes donné la peine de naître, et rien de plus; du reste homme assez ordinaire! Tandis que moi, morbleu! perdu dans la foule obscure, il m'a fallu déployer plus de science et de calculs, pour subsister seulement, qu'on n'en a mis depuis cent ans à gouverner toutes les Espagnes!" Yet Figaro has not lost his old *persiflage:* "Diable! c'est une belle langue que l'anglais, il en faut peu pour aller loin. Avec *God-dam*, en Angleterre, on ne manque de rien nulle part."

Two other characters have helped to make the play immortal, Brid'oison and Chérubin. Don Guzman Brid'oison, a relative by name of the conseiller Goëzman and a descendant of Rabelais's Bridoye who decided cases by the cast of dice, is the stupid, stuttering judge, uttering platitudes ("On est toujours le fils de quelqu'un"), and a slave to routine: "La forme, voyez-vous, la forme! Tel rit d'un juge en habit court, qui-i tremble au seul aspect d'un procureur en robe. La forme, la-a forme!" Chérubin is the boy reaching puberty and troubled with the feelings of sex. The sight of a woman or even of a ribbon or fan arouses in him love. He has the beauty of the unformed youth, the *polissonnerie* of the overwise adolescent. Beaumarchais, who emphasised the need of a woman to play the part, saw in him an androgynous nature. He is one of the insidiously immoral characters of his age, yet less irritating than the smug hero of Saint-Pierre's *Paul et Virginie*.

Beaumarchais is thus, in his life and writings, the epitome of his time, when the privileges of the seventeenth century were passing away, when an adventurer could rise to fame

and fortune by his talents, when the definite overthrow of caste and of nobility was at hand, when the spirit of argument and of dissertation was in the air. But these serious qualities, or defects, were lightened by a ceaseless cascade of wit and epigram, in such abundance as occasionally to become cloying.

CHAPTER XVI

THE REVOLUTION

THE Revolutionary period judged by literature is an ending and not a beginning. Almost all its authors are the *aboutissement* of earlier influences, so that many of them, Chénier, Delille, Lebrun-Pindare, Condorcet, or Volney, have already been dealt with. The new period originates little except in political oratory and journalism.

The French fondness for talk was not going to die away with coming liberty. The *salons* became more than ever the centres of political discussion. Though no other women equal Mme Necker or Mme Roland, the inspirer of the Girondists, still Mme de Beauharnais, Mme Helvétius, Mme de Condorcet, Mme de Sabran show that women are as powerful as ever. Under the Empire Mme de Staël, Mme de Genlis, Mme Récamier, Mme Bacciochi, Mme Joseph Bonaparte, Mme Suard, Mme de Beaumont hold sway.

But conversation between intimates was no longer sufficient, nor was France to be governed by harangues in the street or the Palais-Royal. The new parliamentary government, the Assemblée Constituante, the Assemblée Législative, and the Convention gave an opportunity to new statesmen and demagogues, budding tribunes and consuls to air their rhetoric and interlard plans for utopias with attacks on their opponents. Meanwhile the newspapers gave publicity to their speeches, spread their theories, or outdid the worst yellow journals of today by their abusiveness.

Spoken and written eloquence before the latter part of the eighteenth century had been, as a result of the Classical tradi-

tion, ponderous and majestic in style. The lawyer wanted to impress the judges by his learning, the preacher had the tradition of Bossuet behind him, the speaker at the Academy considered the Olympian attitude becoming to an immortal addressing immortals, the winner in a competition before the same body could not expect success unless his *éloge* conformed to academic standards.

All this was now changed. The chief members of the Constituante were, it is true, lawyers and had acquired their self-possession in the courts or, like Robespierre, before local academies such as that of Arras. They continued it in the clubs and masonic lodges. But big halls of debate now made a call upon new forms of eloquence and greater physical strength, while the presence of the ignorant mob in the galleries, including the impassioned *tricoteuses*, forerunners of the *pétroleuses* of the nineteenth-century Commune, made it often necessary for the orator to imitate Cleon rather than Pericles.[1]

The ideas of the legislative bodies in the Revolutionary days cannot be understood without some knowledge of the teachings of Montesquieu and of Rousseau, of the Encyclopedists and the Economists, of Raynal and Mably, of the rhetoric of Thomas. The Assemblée Constituante, rather a reforming than a subversive body, was largely influenced by the constitutional interpretations of Montesquieu; the Législative and the Convention, having swept away, it was thought, the whole past of France,

[1] See the cry of revolt against all forms of, the cult of antiquity in Berchoux's poem beginning "Qui me délivrera des Grecs et des Romains?," and especially the lines:

Les Grecs et les Romains, mêlés dans nos querelles,
Sont venus présider à nos œuvres nouvelles;
Bientôt tous nos bandits, à Rome transportés,
Se sont crus des héros pour être révoltés;
Bientôt Paris n'a vu que des énergumènes,
De sales Cicérons, de vilains Démosthènes,
Mettant l'assassinat au nombre des vertus,
Egorgeant leurs parents pour faire les Brutus.

tried to bring to earth the hallucinations of Rousseau which Robespierre imposed with the guillotine. The Constituante, again, expressed a nobler intellectual and moral attitude than did its successors. Its members were not yet such embittered *doctrinaires* or shrieking demagogues. Many were visionaries who thought that philosophy could cure national ills, but the majority were patriotic citizens. The decay of the successive assemblies came from exhaustion and disillusion.

The great orator of the Constituante was Mirabeau, although Robespierre was already a member. Gabriel-Honoré de Riquetti, comte de Mirabeau (1749–1791) was hideous in appearance and weighed down by a scandalous past. When he rebuked his brother, fat Mirabeau-Tonneau, for his drunkenness, the latter replied: "Why do you complain? It is the only family vice you have left me." In his youth he had poured out a constant stream of miscellaneous writings, often potboilers. His *liaison* with Mme de Monnier is commemorated by his *Lettres à Sophie*, a private correspondence not intended for publication. His great days were the last two years of his life, when he was a member of the Tiers-Etat.

Mirabeau was an example of the southern politicians who so often, especially under the third Republic, have shouldered out the more reasoning northerner. They may be patriotic and sincere, but their opportunism and lightning changes of conscience can sometimes be justified only by Olympian clouds of rhetoric. Mirabeau's policy was, on the whole, consistent: he was a conservative in temperament rather than a republican and wished to save the monarchy and reconcile it with the rights of man. When he died the Assembly went into mourning and buried him in the Pantheon as a patriot, yet he depended entirely on ruse and Machiavellian methods for the attainment of his purpose. Leader in an assembly calling for independence and self-abnegation, Mirabeau was secretly in the pay of the king. But after all, Mirabeau's chief preoccupation was neither king nor country but self, and he was most eloquent when de-

fending himself against attack or imposing himself on his audience by the power of his shaggy and bristling head. Mirabeau was a double-dealer even to the composition of his speeches: at least eighteen of those he delivered were written for him, and Rivarol called him a "sponge soaked with other people's ideas." But the genuine orator is found in his own improvised speeches. Even here, however, he was not the raging lion that the imagination of Lamartine and Hugo has turned into a tradition, but calm and grave, making sometimes a hesitating exordium and gradually winning such self-possession that he could incorporate into his speech a note handed to him during its delivery or annihilate an adversary by a phrase ("silence aux trente voix," to Barnave and his group).

There could not be a greater contrast with Mirabeau than Maximilien Robespierre (1758–1794), the *bourgeois* lawyer of Arras who, after resigning a judgeship in early life in order not to condemn criminals to death, became, as leader of the Jacobins, the chief headsman of France. Sallow in looks and puritanical in principle, the "sea-green incorruptible" of Carlyle, unsociable in disposition and vain in temperament, he had among men hardly a true friend in the world. Shifty in policy and averse to committing himself, a traitor to his fellows, he had at least one consistent trait, fanaticism. Robespierre was not a ready orator like Mirabeau, his speeches were often labored performances, paraphrases of Rousseau, tumid with moral platitudes, monotonous and academic, abounding in indefiniteness, the language of a mystic and, at times, of a dreamer.

If such is the case, how can one explain Robespierre's power? Firstly, it did not last long; secondly, it was backed by the guillotine; thirdly, he had, with all his treachery, a definite scheme for which he worked with the strength of fanaticism. He was the pontiff of Rousseau and the enforcer of his doctrines. To Robespierre the spirit of Voltaire, Diderot, and the Encyclopedia was anathema: "l'athéisme est aristocratique." He was a deist like his master, and his festival of the Supreme Being,

at which he officiated as chief priest, was a putting into practice of the religion of the vicaire savoyard. Most of all, Robespierre's power rested for a time on the proletariat which he led in the class war of the Revolution. By putting himself at the head of the *sans-culottes* against the aristocrats, as the modern laboring man fights the capitalist, and by endeavoring to replace the old government by a new one in which the state was everywhere omnipotent over the individual, Robespierre brought socialism from theory into politics.[1]

A more sympathetic character is Georges Danton (1759–1794), the "Mirabeau de la populace." Here again was a Caliban in looks, whose "Medusa-head" could go with Mirabeau's *hure;* here again was a magnificent improviser, exuberant in language, though even more brutal and abusive. But Danton cared less for himself than did Mirabeau and more for his fellowmen. Unlike Robespierre he did not base religion and politics on vague phraseology about virtue, but on practical contingencies in the establishment of justice between man and man. Where Robespierre was the *doctrinaire*, Danton was the doer; often incoherent, cruel, and misguided, but better intentioned and less hypocritical. For this he paid with his life: though a Montagnard like Robespierre, he was executed by him as too moderate. Danton is one of those who emerge from the turmoil of discussion about the Revolution with the reaction most in his favor. He stands for the practical application of the theories of the eighteenth-century *philosophes* without so much of Robespierre's twist of tyrannical Rousseauism.

The other orators of the Revolution, though numerous, rank after those mentioned. Among the Jacobins there was Saint-Just (1767–1794), executed at the age of twenty-seven in the reaction against the Terror. In his brief career he showed the

[1] "Robespierre must take his place permanently in history as the prime exponent in actual politics of the cardinal Socialist principle of the class war." — W. Lawler Wilson, *The Menace of Socialism*. But Robespierre's socialism is as yet only administrative and not economic.

cold heartlessness of Robespierre together with the audacity of Danton and combined some of the moralising fanaticism of the one with the eagerness for action of the other, though inclining to the side of Robespierre.

The chief sympathy of the student today goes out to the group of Girondist orators, because of their fate. They were far from being all southerners from the Gironde, though the meridionals were their real leaders. In spite of their numbers they were weaker than the Jacobins of the Mountain, because they had less cohesion in their views and were a party of relative moderation rather than of persecution. Though Rousseauists, they were followers more of the vague side of Rousseau, the sentimental humanitarianism of his morals, and the undefined anti-dogmatic deism of his religion. As a party of negation rather than of construction they had little help to offer for the reconstruction of France, and to the brutal Jacobins they seemed supercilious dreamers deserving only scorn for their impotent liberalism, their thoughts of a government where the philosopher might be king, a government that should represent France rather than the Paris mob.

The Girondists had poor strategy and no generalship. They were not helped by their chief leader, Vergniaud (1753–1793), a brilliant improviser, but apathetic and indolent in his fatalism. The other great orators of the Girondist party were Guadet, Gensonné, Brissot, and Buzot, whose name is linked with that of Mme Roland, the "Egeria" of the party. This young and beautiful wife of one of the ministers of the Republic, inspired by Plutarch and stoicism as well as by Rousseau, guided the ministerial policy of her husband and the feelings of her set. After the downfall of the Girondists, for which she was partly to blame by discouraging an alliance with Danton, she went to the guillotine with the firmness of her philosophy, and spent the last days in prison in writing her memoirs to justify her friends and to defend herself against calumny.

The spoken word was far from being the only means of com-

munication open to the Revolution. Modern journalism in France really dates from that period and becomes one of the chief methods of publicity for the polemists. The eighteenth century had been the time of political pamphlets, sometimes appearing with a certain amount of regularity like periodicals. During the Revolution these became more numerous, especially in 1789 and 1790. Within five years about a thousand newspapers, usually shortlived, had appeared, displacing each other in turn, bearing the names of *Journal*, *Gazette*, *Courrier*, or mere fantastic titles. They were often incorrectly written, badly printed, violently personal, and in their worst examples descended to the lowest grade of gutter abuse. The transcendent rôle in virulence was played by Marat and Hébert. The former, a seeker for notoriety, published the *Ami du peuple* to stir up discussion and arm one citizen against another, until he himself was slain by Charlotte Corday's knife, and his corpse, stripped to the waist, was carried to the grave amid flaring torches and a theatrical display which would have delighted his vanity if he could have known it. Hébert, in the *Père Duchesne*, poured out a steady stream of filthy language ("Grande colère du Père Duchesne," etc.) against the "royal ogre" and "pig" Louis XVI, or the "infamous Austrian" and "she-wolf" Marie-Antoinette. The royalist party had, in the early days, a mouthpiece not much less cynical, but at any rate with some cleverness in such a paper as the *Actes des Apôtres* of Rivarol and his friends. One newspaper, the *Journal des Débats*, started in 1789 as a mere record of public discussions, grew under the Empire into a general newspaper, and is still published at its original home in the rue des Prêtres-Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois. A single journalist only, Camille Desmoulins, deserves extended mention as a contributor to literature.

Camille Desmoulins (1760–1794) is usually remembered standing on his table in the Palais-Royal and stirring up the populace to the frenzy which resulted in the fall of the Bastille. As a matter of fact, he was a poor orator and stammered. On the

other hand, the vigor of his writing, in spite of its incoherence, is great. A man of education and refinement, he turned to the advocacy of violence and became a partisan of lynch-law, calling himself "procureur-général de la lanterne" after the public street-lanterns from which victims could be suspended. A nihilist like Voltaire, he led the attacks against the Austrian queen or against Louis Capet—for to him was due that name—or against Brissot and the moderate Girondists. The time came when Desmoulins, like Danton, repented of violence and tried to counsel mercy to his old school-friend Robespierre. Nothing availed and Robespierre, who had been a witness at the signing of Desmoulins' marriage contract, sent him to the guillotine.

Desmoulins' chief newspapers were the *Révolutions de France et de Brabant* and then the *Vieux Cordelier*. The former was a periodical of abuse, the latter one of protest, aimed directly at Hébert and the advanced revolutionists, indirectly attempting to win over Robespierre. The third number, denouncing the Terror in the style of Tacitus, is deemed his masterpiece. But in spite of his vigor Desmoulins was not a careful writer; his pathetic farewell to his beloved wife Lucile sinks from the sublime to the ridiculous:

"Console-toi, veuve désolée! L'épitaphe de ton pauvre Camille est glorieuse: c'est celle des Brutus et des Caton, les tyrannicides. . . . Pardon, chère amie, ma véritable vie, que j'ai perdue du moment qu'on nous a séparés! Je m'occupe de ma mémoire. Je devrais bien plutôt m'occuper de te la faire oublier, ma Lucile, mon bon loulou, ma poule!"

The prominent men of the Revolution were not all orators or journalists alone. The abbé Emmanuel Sieyès (1748–1836), though a member of the Etats-Généraux and the Convention, was more often silent than a speaker. President of the Directoire and responsible for Napoleon's *coup d'état* of the eighteenth of Brumaire, he became one of the three consuls, count of the Empire, ambassador, and president of the Senate. His import-

ance rests on his work in the committees of the Constituante and his fame on his great pamphlet on the Tiers-Etat, "really all, hitherto nothing, seeking to be something." By this document Sieyès may almost be said to have precipitated the Revolution, just as he later made Napoleon.

Sieyès was an *a priori* theorist, a metaphysician drawing up constitutions, inapt at government, yet holding important positions and responsible for great changes such as the transformation of the Etats-Généraux into Assemblée Nationale, and the division of France into departments.

Nicolas Chamfort (1741–1794) was at first an author of plays, but is remembered today by his witticisms and satirical anecdotes. Soured by his illegitimate origin and by his natural bias, he was cynical and misanthropic, like an eighteenth-century La Rochefoucauld, and love, friendship, marriage were never free from his gibes. Chamfort's biting tongue got him into trouble, and trying to escape a second arrest he shot himself, cut his throat, stabbed himself, and opened his veins before he managed to put an end to his life.

Antoine Rivarol (1753–1801), the embodiment of brilliancy in conversation, in prose epigram, and tabloid satire, was not merely a journalist as already stated, supporting royalty in the *Journal politique national* and the *Actes des Apôtres*, but a parodist and a slayer of conceited literary small fry. His *Petit almanach de nos grands hommes* pilloried poets capable of such stanzas as:

Hélas! hélas! hélas! hélas!
Il lui coupa le cou d'un coup de coutelas!

Nor was he afraid of bigger game, such as Delille. He translated Dante, he competed successfully before the Berlin Academy with an essay on the universality of the French language, he wrote an elaborate prospectus for a dictionary he never prepared.

Chamfort and Rivarol are almost the last examples of the *esprit* of the eighteenth century and of its *salons:* graceful, polished, irreverent, unmoral, unreal, based on but a partial

and a partisan knowledge of mankind. They were Voltaire and Beaumarchais reduced to epigrams. There have been men like them before and since, but the environment being different, the result has been other.

The drama of the Revolution gave practically nothing worthy of commemoration in spite of a great vogue which nothing diminished. The theatres were packed as usual, we are told, on the night of events like the execution of Marie-Antoinette. Over a thousand plays were given in ten years, but they were almost entirely *pièces de circonstance*, written as the mouthpiece for political theories, or to replace public harangues. In spite of the political revolution they remained Classical in form, but are often scarcely to be differentiated from "dramas." A popular tirade, regardless of its literary value, was sure to win applause, and it was only necessary to surround it with sentimentality or persecuted innocence to make the audience gush into tears. The dramatic motive was subordinate to the political aim, and the structure of the play had no consequence. Marie-Joseph Chénier wrote in 1789 a *Charles IX* which purported to be a "national" tragedy and a "lesson to kings," and of which Danton said: "Figaro a tué la noblesse, Charles IX tuera la royauté." In fact, nearly all of Chénier's plays are diatribes against the old régime. *Henri VIII* shows up the cruel and imbecile tyrant, *Jean Calas* attacks religious fanaticism, *Caïus Gracchus* is against the nobles, and *Fénelon* against convents. The *Ami des lois* of Louis Laya in 1793, an attack on Robespierre, Marat, and the demagogues at the time of the king's trial, caused the canons of the authorities to be aimed at the theatre, and the actors imprisoned.

In comedy matters were not quite so bad. The *Châteaux en Espagne* and the *Vieux célibataire* of Collin d'Harleville may still be read with pleasure; the *Philinte* of Fabre d'Eglantine, a sequel to the *Misanthrope* of Molière to bring out Rousseau's idea of Philinte as a selfish man, gets a borrowed interest. And the Revolutionary period popularised, in addition to its pre-

:ursors Figaro and Arlequin, certain humorous types not for-
gotten today, Nicodème, a simple but canny peasant (this type
ıas degenerated into an "innocent"), and Madame Angot, the
ishwife grown rich and, like Monsieur Jourdain, aping her
›etters. The play *Madame Angot, ou la poissarde parvenue* of
Maillot and the *Madame Angot au sérail de Constantinople* by
Aude are the ancestors of the modern *Fille de Madame Angot*,
:hat most successful of operettas, first played in 1873.

PART V

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

CHAPTER I

THE EMPIRE

THE liberator Napoleon soon proved a tyrant: literature and oratory languished under the censorship and threats of imprisonment. The discourses of politicians were no longer heard, and Napoleon alone was free to harangue his troops and tell them how "forty centuries looked down on them from the Pyramids," or disguise in the language of moderation and statesmanship the lawlessness of the usurper.

One group of men Napoleon could not crush: these were the philosophers, the Ideologists, whom he scornfully called the *idéologues*. They were no new invention, but the successors and disciples of Condillac, Helvétius, and the *philosophes;* and Condorcet, and Volney, whom we have already studied, belong to the line of filiation. But under the new régime, these "nebulous metaphysicians," as Napoleon also called them, still inspired by the principles of freedom which the Revolution had failed to establish, represented the spirit of liberal opposition in politics, literature, and philosophy, or the rights of reason untrammelled by imperial discipline. Their influence, too, made itself felt in many of the newly-established scientific schools and bodies: the Normal, Central, and Polytechnic schools, the Institute. At the Normal School, established under the Convention, the lecturers had included Volney, no less than Saint-Pierre and La Harpe, and the mathematicians Laplace, Lagrange, and Monge. The periodical of this school of thinkers was the *Décade philosophique*, and the social centre was the group of Auteuil, gathered about the widow of Condorcet and her sister, the wife of Cabanis. The school, it may be seen, stands for the anti-religious attitude.

The chief Ideologists were Cabanis and Destutt de Tracy. Cabanis (1757–1808) a doctor, the friend of Franklin, the author of the *Rapports du physique et du moral*, far from being a "nebulous metaphysician," swept away metaphysics, disclaimed any real knowledge of first causes, and devoted himself to physiology and psychology. Studying the relations between the body and "soul," with emphasis on the former as more accessible to direct experiment, he united them and made physiology and psychology one. He described the relation, by what was perhaps even to him only a figure of speech, in saying that "the brain digests impressions and secretes thought," and its function is to produce images and group them, just as the stomach acts and reacts on food for the production of tissues.

Destutt de Tracy (1781–1864), of Scotch origin and a collateral descendant of the Jansenist Arnauld, had the hard-headed logical aptitudes of both origins. His interest is in logic and the problems of knowledge, in his *Eléments d'idéologie*, his Grammar, and his Logic, but he still rested philosophy on physiology.

Cabanis and Destutt de Tracy are but the most prominent representatives of a whole scientific school occupied with the various divisions of the intellectual life, so that Daunou, Fauriel,[1] Ginguené, Raynouard in historical research, J.-B. Say in economics, helped to introduce a better method into their fields of study. The Ideologists are neglected today, but they belong to the genealogy of positive science. Cabanis was the creator of physiological psychology in France, and he and De Tracy were the precursors, not merely of worn-out creeds, such as the phrenology of Gall and Spurzheim, but of more vital systems of evolution and of positivism.

The Ideologists did not represent the only philosophical

[1] Daunou (1761–1840) initiated Sainte-Beuve into both the literary and the philosophical traditions of the eighteenth century, and Fauriel (1772–1844) into historical method and the widening of knowledge and sympathy of the nineteenth. Fauriel occupied somewhat the position of a French Herder. Cf. *Portraits contemporains*, Vol. IV.

school of their time. Without going so far as the mystic Saint-Martin, the "philosophe inconnu" as he called himself, the translator of Jacob Böhme and follower of Swedenborg, there were opposed to them those thinkers, critics more than men of science, called the Traditionalists. They stood for the reaction against the French Revolution and a return to the spirit of Catholicism. Like those French thinkers who at the end of the nineteenth century announced the bankruptcy of science, they proclaimed at its beginning the failure of eighteenth-century philosophism, but attacked it with its own tools of argumentation and reason. The chief of these thinkers were the comte Joseph de Maistre and the vicomte de Bonald, between whom there were great similarities, though their conclusions were independently reached.

Joseph de Maistre (1754–1821), though a great name in French literature, was not a Frenchman and came to Paris only once in his life for a brief period. A native of Savoy and an official of the king of Sardinia, he spent nearly fifteen years as minister of his sovereign in Russia. His life was not a happy one: whether by his own fault or not, he was constantly struggling against injustice and lack of appreciation on the part of the king. He might seem to have about him something of the "man with a grievance," did not the brilliancy of his conversation and the amenity of his correspondence testify to wit and graces. His disappointments seem, however, to have soured his view of life, and his theory is one of cruelty and inhumanity.

Maistre is the chief religious mediævalist of modern times. To him, much as in the old allegorical interpretations, the world is a gross representation of the celestial reality. The spirit of modern times was to him anathema, and men of science called forth his curses. His treatise on Baconian philosophy is a mass of vituperation and abuse. An intellectual descendant of the old Scholastic and rigidly argumentative theologians, though his *Soirées de Saint-Pétersbourg* take the form of fluid Platonic *entretiens*, he places religion above everything else. God rules the world by the principle of authority, not regulating

every action, but leaving to men a certain freedom that sins may be the better punished. For by chastisement men's sins are atoned. The individual may suffer unjustly, but he is a part of humanity undergoing retribution for collective misdeeds. And so Maistre comes to justify warfare and the executioner, as the agent of God, the judge, applying the *lex talionis*.

As God is the source of authority, on him depend the representatives of sovereignty: the monarch in the temporal, the pope above the monarch in the religious sphere. Maistre is the firm partisan of kingship against any form of government which, like republicanism, implies a solution of continuity; he is in his treatise *Du Pape* the leader in doctrines of "ultramontanism" and papal infallibility. Thus Maistre is the great religious reactionary of modern times, and he did more than any one else to create the state of mind which resulted in the proclamation of papal infallibility in 1870. It is obvious how, at every step, Joseph de Maistre is opposed to the spirit of the eighteenth century: to the anti-religious Voltairianism, to Rousseau's doctrines of the independence of primitive man and the free contract. He is no less hostile to what seemed to him to verge on heresy in the Catholic church, Gallicanism (*De l'eglise gallicane*), or the even worse Jansenism.

The other important Traditionalist was Louis de Bonald (1754–1840), a cut and dried logician, who undertook to prove everything by a sort of rule of three in which the terms were cause, means, and effect. Bonald considers man as passive, a *tabula rasa* without innate ideas, just as the most pronounced Condillacian would have done, but the active cause is God instead of sensation. The world is created by God and in the image of God. Thus Bonald is nothing but an inverted eighteenth-century *philosophe*, replacing by the word "God" and thus ranging himself as a spiritualist, all that the others had attributed to matter.

Under the Empire criticism had to be subordinate to the censorship. The reaction against the Revolution necessitated

conservative judgments and the rule of the old Classical spirit expressed in the grand style. Independence of mind, such as that of Mme de Staël, encountered persecution. Moreover, by a peculiar but not unparalleled manifestation, the fiercest political iconoclasts tended to be literary conservatives. Therefore, Marie-Joseph Chénier, the former Jacobin, was entrusted by the Academy with the drawing-up of an orthodox *Tableau* of literature since 1789. The legislative bodies were reduced to impotence, the bar and the pulpit had to re-echo the praises of Napoleon. The newspapers were closely watched and the *Journal des Débats*, become *Journal de l'Empire*, was alone smiled upon by authority. Among critics occupied in rhetorical compositions on the beauties of the seventeenth-century literature, or in reviling the audacity of the scientists, only Geoffroy and Fontanes stand in the first rank, though Hoffman, Dussault, Féletz had reputation in their day.

Julien-Louis Geoffroy (1743–1814), who had begun his career as the successor of Fréron in the *Année littéraire*, became the dramatic critic of the *Journal des Débats* and the founder of the *feuilleton* criticism of current dramatic literature. He was a dry and narrow as well as vicious critic, a partisan of the seventeenth century, and particularly of Corneille, perhaps partly because Voltaire had ventured to criticise that poet in his *Commentaire*.[1]

Louis Fontanes (1757–1821), who had begun his career by mild-mannered but not unmeritorious meditative poetry, became finally Grand Master of the University and dispenser of Napoleon's literary favors.

Joseph Joubert (1754–1824), the friend of men like Fontanes and Chateaubriand, of women of talent like Mme de Beaumont and Mme de Vintimille, the valetudinarian and recluse, left at his death many papers, from which in 1838 a posthumous volume

[1] Napoleon himself liked to lay down the law with regard to the drama besides listening to his favorite actor Talma, and would analyse the Cornelian heroes from the standpoint of the imperial usurper.

of fragments afterwards enlarged, the *Pensées*, was gathered. Joubert is but little read by the French, and is perhaps more appreciated by the cultivated English-speaking people as a result of Matthew Arnold's essay. But as a moralist he deserves a place after Pascal, La Rochefoucauld, and Vauvenargues, and his wise judgments place him high among the interpreters of literature. His preferences were for the seventeenth century, with reservations, as opposed to the eighteenth.

The production of novels in the Empire days was large. Napoleon was a prolific reader of literature of a certain kind, Ossianesque in vagueness and sentimental in plot. He could not stand Mme de Staël or Chateaubriand for political reasons. "More novels ending in A!" he said when *Atala* appeared; "take it away!" But writers like Ducray-Duminil flourished. This author, after composing placid stories for the young, fell under the influence of translations of Mrs. Radcliffe's novels, such as the *Mysteries of Udolpho*. His chief books, *Victor, ou l'enfant de la forêt* and *Cœlina, ou l'enfant du mystère*, had tremendous vogue. Ducray-Duminil's stories had the usual paraphernalia of the English "School of Terror," ruined houses, mysterious bells, strange disguises, imprisoned heroines, murders, and the like, all embalmed in moralisings and virtuous instructions. Mme Cottin's no less eminently moral but calmer stories such as *Elisabeth*, are still known to old-fashioned English readers.

There were, however, novels of a different character. Pigault-Lebrun was the counterpart of Ducray-Duminil from the standpoint of popularity in "improper" literature. Mme de Krüdener, the Russian Swedenborgian mystic, was the author of *Valérie*, published in 1803, and through her influence over the emperor Alexander of Russia, the instigator of the Holy Alliance. Xavier de Maistre, the brother of Joseph de Maistre and himself a general in the Russian service, wrote several works of fiction under the influence of Sterne, such as the *Voyage autour de ma chambre*, and the *Lépreux de la vallée d'Aoste*.

Poetry and the drama ran in a very thin stream under the Empire. Mechanical tragedies patterned after Corneille and Voltaire were galvanised into life by Talma, or by Mlle Georges and Mlle Mars, and then only if they passed the censorship. They were of the type of literature that the irreverent Romanticists were to call "vieille perruque," because of the wigs of the old fogey conservatives faithful to the fashions of their youth, or "pompier," because the heroes of Classical painting and play, with their Greek or Roman helmets, fatally suggested a French fireman's headpiece. Népomucène Lemercier's *Agamemnon* in 1797 marked the real climax of the Classical school. But its mechanical side in its degeneracy may be seen in Brifaut's play, originally intended to be a Spanish drama named *Don Sanche*, and for political considerations due to the war in Spain, modified under orders from the censor, transferred to Assyria and changed without difficulty into *Ninus II*. The greatest popular success of the period was Raynouard's *Templiers*, in which the author drew his subject from French history instead of from antiquity. Luce de Lancival's *Hector* was another epoch-making play. Lemercier's *Pinto* is looked upon as a precursor of the historical comedy and Romantic drama, though he hated the Romanticists. His *Christophe Colomb* caused riots and deaths at the performance because of some bold rhymes and epithets. The specific comedy writers were Picard, Alexandre Duval, and Etienne.

The poets were numerous and voluble: they had nothing to say, and said it at great length. The Classicists wrote solemn epics drawn from national history, as became the bards of imperial heroism, or poured forth verses to order for state functions. Delille and his school gave out their descriptive poetry and drawing-room treatises on agriculture. In lyric and elegiac verse, though there was little vigor and originality, there was less pretence. The dreamy sentiment of Millevoye, already discussed, and of Chênedollé (1769–1833), precursors of Lamartine, was in vogue. Chateaubriand complained of the way

in which Chênedollé ransacked him for motives and inspiration. Often the lyricism found expression in the *genre troubadour*, ballads and songs of pseudo-mediævalism, of which we have an example in English in some of the songs of Thomas Haynes Bayly:

> Gaily the troubadour
> Touched his guitar,
> As he came riding
> Home from the war.

One writer, the marquis de Surville, even tried the experiment of Chatterton and of Macpherson, and wrote a large collection of archaic stanzas which were published as the authentic productions of a fifteenth-century ancestress, Clotilde de Surville, and caused great discussion. Macpherson's *Ossian* itself, still accepted without controversy, found a translator in Baour-Lormian (1770–1854), who likewise, in his *Veillées poétiques et morales*, inspired by Young, developed the willow and cypress melancholy which was an element of the milder form of Romanticism.

Fortunately all poetry was not given over to gloom. The witty Classicist Andrieux (1759–1833) wrote, among other things, comedies, verse stories, and fables, of which the *Meunier de Sans-Souci* remains in all anthologies. Arnault (1766–1834) was another ambitious playwright who won a name with posterity rather for his epigrammatic fables. The "Caveau moderne," a successor to the eighteenth-century associations, had as chief founder Désaugiers (1772–1827), the greatest song writer along with Béranger; and his *Monsieur et Madame Denis* and *Paris à cinq heures du matin* belong to the undying *répertoire* of the French *chanson*.

CHAPTER II

MME DE STAËL

GERMAINE NECKER (1766–1817) or, to give her the name under which she won fame, Mme de Staël, was the daughter of the Swiss banker Necker, who made fruitless attempts to reform the finances of France, and of his wife, renowned by her *salon*. As a girl she was an excellent example of the infant phenomenon of her sentimental environment. She was the emotional disciple of Rousseau, as Mme Roland was the heroic one. The elopement of Clarissa Harlowe, she afterwards said, was the principal event of her youth, the reading of *Werther* being another turning-point. At the age of ten she wanted to marry her mother's former lover, Gibbon, in order to keep so much genius in the family, and spent much of her time discussing love with the guests at her mother's gatherings. This compound of brains and emotion was, by her ambitious mother, married to the Swedish envoy in Paris, the baron de Staël-Holstein. After a while they lived together only at intervals; Mme de Staël was too intellectual for her husband, but she did him the service of paying his debts. The prominence of her family and her position, as well as her fondness for talking and dabbling in politics, kept Mme de Staël in hot water all her life; she incurred the violent hatred of Bonaparte, who delighted in persecuting her and banished her from Paris. He was thoroughly justified in so doing, from his point of view, for Mme de Staël was a most potent anti-Napoleonic force in Europe. But it was torture to one who longed for the excitement of the capital. In spite of her fine estate at Coppet, near Geneva, where people came to see her, she was restless and unhappy:

the "infernal quiet" of Coppet she called it. She travelled in Germany, Italy, Russia, Sweden, and England; she expected more then once to go, willingly or unwillingly, to America; she tried to establish herself in various places in France, gradually diminishing the prohibited radius of forty leagues from Paris, but was as constantly expelled.

Mme de Staël's name is intimately connected with that of Benjamin Constant, who for years hung about her skirts. Neither found in the other the perfect lover; there was constant irritation, and yet they could not separate; he called her an "homme-femme" in anger at her mastery over his weakness, and she, with corresponding petulance, when a widow, exclaimed: "Rather than lose him, I'll marry him." She did not, because he stole a march on her and got another wife, but her desire for love was at last satisfied by a pretty boy named Rocca, nearly twenty years younger than herself, whom the world looked upon as her *cicisbeo*, but to whom she was secretly married in 1811.[1]

Mme de Staël was the most brilliant woman of her time and the most wonderful conversationalist; her writings do not contain a tithe of her wealth of ideas. She was an intellectual hurricane, "a thunderstorm, an earthquake," said Constant; "la science en jupons," said Joseph de Maistre. Most men fled before her arguments, consequently hated her; Schiller said, upon leaving her, that he felt as though he had recovered from a severe illness. She requested Fichte to expound in fifteen minutes his philosophy, which it had taken him years to evolve, and before he had finished she told him that his *ego* reminded her of Baron Munchausen pulling himself across a stream by his own coat-sleeve. Unfortunately Mme de Staël was overconscious of her genius: "I understand all that deserves to be understood," she told Crabbe Robinson; "what I do not under-

[1] Personally Rocca was a dashing and heroic officer who had been nearly shot to pieces in military service. Mme de Staël married what was left of him.

stand does not deserve comprehension." And, as she was not beautiful, her enemies made fun of this masculine woman travelling over Europe, dressed as her own heroine Corinne, wearing a showy turban,[1] carrying a spray of laurel, talking volubly, escorted by Benjamin Constant, and looking for some one to love.

This irreverent but necessary description of Mme de Staël does not detract from her greatness; though writing was no pleasure to her she produced some of the most noteworthy books in French, and is looked upon as the most important influence in moulding the literary temper of her time and the following generation. Her chief works were her treatises *De la littérature considérée dans ses rapports avec les institutions sociales*, and *De l'Allemagne*, her novels *Delphine* and *Corinne*, as well as the posthumous *Considérations sur la Révolution française* and *Dix années d'exil*.

Mme de Staël's early writings show the almost undiluted influence of Rousseau. In her first books, the *Lettres sur Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, the *Essai sur les fictions*, and the treatise *De l'influence des passions sur le bonheur des individus et des nations*, the author, suffering from the emotional crisis of the Revolution, develops a reaction against the rationalistic methods of reflection of the pseudo-Classicists, appeals to nature and impulse, proclaims the right to voice the passions and impart them to others. *Delphine* was to be the expression of this *état d'âme*.

On the other hand, the work *De la littérature* is under the influence of eighteenth-century philosophy and expounds the doctrine of perfectibility. To Mme de Staël the human mind is in constant progress and she tries, as a Montesquieu might do, to evolve philosophical considerations on its history and on the parallel connection between politics and letters. Written,

[1] "Elle était vêtue comme la sibylle du Dominiquin, un châle des Indes autour de sa tête, et ses cheveux, du plus beau noir, entremêlés avec ce châle." — *Corinne*, Book II, chap. i.

though not published, in the revolutionary glow, the book declares that, under the freedom of republican institutions, literature will prosper more than ever. But this partly discarded theory is not what makes the importance of the book. The author looked still further and saw a new source of strength in the northern nations. Though Mme de Staël was already familiar with England, she as yet knew little of Germany at first hand. But as a Swiss and a Protestant, she belonged both to the Latin and the Teutonic culture, an antithesis, as she herself said, between the French taste and the northern sentiments which undermined her life. None the less it enabled her to distinguish the separate tendencies and formulate a theory which, though not entirely satisfactory, proved fertile in its suggestiveness. This was the doctrine of southern and northern literatures expressive of the two different peoples: the one a literature of art and form, the other a literature of personal feeling, with original qualities, such as the deeper view of life, together with enthusiasm and tenderness. To Mme de Staël one of the chief reasons of the "superiority" of northern writers is the Protestant religion of the north opposed to the Catholicism of the south.

The attempt to broaden French culture, whether one call it Cosmopolitanism, Germanisation, or Europeanisation, was continued in her book *De l'Allemagne*. Individual German authors had been read before Mme de Staël's time; she made Germany known. Her book has been called the most masculine product of the faculties of woman. That statement may perhaps stand, though we need not forget that a great German critic, August Wilhelm Schlegel, was for years a tutor in Mme de Staël's family and she had every opportunity to eviscerate him. But at a time when Napoleon was trying to crush the German spirit, Mme de Staël proclaimed to his face the qualities of the people, analysed their civilisation, literature, art, philosophy, morals, religion, and "enthusiasm," and declared the need of a regeneration of the French mind by contact with the northern

race. It was a sort of call to self-consciousness of a sleeping people oppressed by a foreign tyrant. The book had also extraordinary effect in bringing about a change in the succeeding French Romanticism. Mme de Staël did much to make the French less traditionalists, leading them to welcome the portrayal of personal feeling, whencesoever it came, and to adopt, at least for a time, a mentality as well as a sentimentality, compounded from England and Germany, grafted on Rousseau. Thus she is one of the most important characters in the early history of Romanticism in France.

In the unfinished *Considérations sur la Révolution française* Mme de Staël sought to defend her father's ministerial policy, to show how the Revolution had been a failure because of the warring of parties, followed by tyranny instead of the establishment of true revolutionary principles. Harmony could come only by a return to the original aims for which the Revolution was started: a constitutional monarchy based on liberal foundations. This could be taken as a warning to the government of Louis XVIII. The book was one of the important contributions to the ideas of the school of French liberal statesmen and theorists during the Restoration and the reign of Louis-Philippe, known as the *doctrinaires* (Royer-Collard, Guizot, Charles de Rémusat, etc.).

It might be supposed that a firm believer in progress would be a consistent optimist. But Mme de Staël's emotions were separate from her theories and were those, soon to become so familiar, of the lonely soul pining for sympathy. A generation later this feeling found expression in the *femme incomprise*, at war with her social environment. This phase of Mme de Staël's character is represented by her novels. *Delphine* and *Corinne* are works of semi-autobiographical analysis, again testifying to the influence of Rousseau. *Delphine*, a novel in the form of letters, tells the story of a beautiful young woman whose actions are, by a chain of circumstances, constantly misinterpreted by public opinion and by the man she loves, until at last both have waded through weeping to the grave. The

novel made its readers cry as copiously and, though the setting of the plot was on the whole a vague one, still the identification of Talleyrand with one of the female characters and the discussion of burning questions such as divorce made the novel a sensation.

Corinne is far more interesting to the modern reader. The character of Delphine was Mme de Staël as she saw herself, Corinne was Mme de Staël as she would have wished to be. It was the result, also, of her Italian journey and the reaction of the wonderful southern land on a lover of art and romance. The fairly slender plot, again portraying the conflict of love and of social obligations, is set in an Italian frame. The heroine is the intellectually superior woman kept from her lover by the rigidity of Anglo-Saxon worldly considerations.

For the reader of Mme de Staël's own day *Corinne* not only opened new floodgates of tears, but it also did the service of interpreting Italy anew to the modern world: in terms of sentiment, it is true, but that did no great harm immediately after the mock-stoic misinterpretations of the eighteenth-century thinkers. Corinne and Oswald visiting the Campagna, the Appian Way, and the tomb of Cæcilia Metella illustrate once more the influence of ruins on the imagination, as they had impressed Sulpicius Rufus amid the glories of decaying Greece, Petrarch, Du Bellay, and Chateaubriand in this same Rome, Gibbon planning at sunset on the Capitoline hill his history of the decline and fall, Volney at Palmyra, and the Romantic poets after Mme de Staël. In her book the touch of feminine sentiment has almost lyric and elegiac expression. For that reason one readily forgives a guide-book aspect, as of the tourist personally conducted by a disciple of Schlegel, Winckelmann, Lessing, and Goethe,[1] and *Corinne* can be enjoyed by the visitor

[1] "Je vous fais passer, dit Corinne à ceux qui l'accompagnaient, sur les bords du lac d'Arverne, puis du Phlégéthon, et voilà devant vous le temple de la sibylle de Cumes. Nous traversons les lieux célébrés sous le nom des Délices de Bayes, mais je vous propose de ne pas vous y arrêter dans

to Italy now. In its own time it roused the greatest enthusiasm, and today, though the tradition of Clarissas and of Malvinas has passed away, an occasional Corinne still shows how the memory of a heroine of fiction has been handed down from grandmother to mother and daughter.

If Corinne stands for Mme de Staël, the *Adolphe* (1816) of Benjamin Constant (1767–1830) represents him in his relations with her, she bearing the name of Ellénore. Mme de Staël's man is the conventional lover; not so with Constant. *Adolphe* is an important document in the series of semi-autobiographical romances. Though the characters are intentionally made misleading, it is easy to read between the lines the restless as well as selfish intimacy of Constant with Mme de Staël, together with hints of other among his amorous experiences. The story is really the mental analysis of a man who has become weary of the woman he loved, but does not know what to do and has not strength of mind to come to a decision. The acuteness of the psychic dissection and the truthful reproduction of the hero's states of mind make the book an important document for the study of character, a striking example of the early nineteenth-century irresolution, but it is not stimulating reading. It illustrates the indecision characteristic of Constant, the product of a rigid Swiss Calvinism, but one who, having lost his faith during an era of disenchantment, suffered from the morbid condition which is apt to be the result of such a mental and moral evolution.

ce moment. Nous recueillerons les souvenirs de l'histoire et de la poésie qui nous entourent ici quand nous arriverons dans un lieu d'où nous pourrons les apercevoir tous à la fois." — *Corinne*, Book XIII, chap. iii.

CHAPTER III

CHATEAUBRIAND

CHATEAUBRIAND is, with Ronsard and Hugo, an example of the vicissitudes of literary renown. During his lifetime no one in the universe more nearly reached deification. Yet no sooner was he gone than unfortunate circumstances connected with the publication of his memoirs, and the unfavorable criticism of Sainte-Beuve, backed up by his insidious footnotes, destroyed a reputation which has only recently been recovered. Chateaubriand was, after all, the founder of Romantic literature and the most important figure of the first half of the nineteenth century.

Chateaubriand was not a normal being, and Romanticism, which had its ultimate source in the lunatic Rousseau, had, as father, one whose melancholy, stamped on his school, came near being pathological. He was the son of a morbidly taciturn man, and one of his sisters became insane and probably committed suicide.

François-René de Chateaubriand was born in 1768 at Saint-Malo in Brittany. When not at school at Dol, Dinan, or Rennes, he spent his time in the gloomy parental manor of Combourg, a prey to childish visions and dreams, oppressed by the melancholy and *ennui* from which he was never free, and which led him to think of suicide. His only consolation was the sympathetic companionship of his sister Lucile, a creature more morbid and unfit to live than he, but who awakened in him his literary taste. It was she who went insane. In 1786, just before his father's death, he became an officer in the army, but a few years later, restless and impatient and with something of

the wanderlust of Rousseau about him, he started in 1791 to America to discover the Northwest Passage.

This journey to the United States lasted less than a year, including the sea voyages, but it is one of the great dates in French literature. It marked the true awakening of the man of letters; it disclosed a new source of local coloring which set the fashion and gave Chateaubriand material that lasted him through life. The whole trip has been the subject of harsh criticism: it has been incorrectly denied that he ever could have seen General Washington, and it is difficult to believe that he could have made the long expeditions he indicates to the West and the Mississippi valley. On the other hand, if he had remained near Niagara, as it has been suggested he did, he could have found there as much material for literary treatment as in the south where the scenes of his stories lie. As to his crazy American flora and fauna, he was no scientific observer but an imaginative writer who put into nature what he thought should be there. So Americans may smile in reading of the Meschacébé (Mississippi) rolling past meadows where dwell green snakes, blue herons, and pink flamingoes, or on which young crocodiles go sailing down on floating islands of pines, oaks, and water-lilies, past forests with trees bound together by festooned creepers, where stagger bears drunk with grapes, or where green parrots with yellow heads mingle with cardinals, humming-birds, and hissing serpents. The judicious will conclude that Chateaubriand's imagination, like his landscapes, was tropical, and will admire his descriptions, not for their exactness but for their beauty. The ferret-critic will also add that he had read the Père Charlevoix's *Histoire et description de la Nouvelle France*, William Bartram's *Travels*, and Beltrami's *Pilgrimage*.

One night in the wilderness Chateaubriand came upon a tattered newspaper in English, telling of the flight of the king and the incident of Varennes. A royalist nobleman and partisan of the king, he gave up his journey and returned at once to France, reaching home penniless. He soon let his family marry

him to a young woman for whom he felt no predilection, but who proved to be of the saintly type, and who lived almost as long as he did, forgiving his infidelities and neglect, the whims and manias of a man of genius. Within a few months Chateaubriand joined the army of the *émigrés*, and before long, wounded and diseased, weakened by fever and smallpox, he found himself in 1793 a penniless refugee in London. There the proud aristocrat, sometimes actually hungry, made a precarious living by hackwriting, translating, or teaching, called "Shatterbrain" by his pupils. Meanwhile he worked at the *Natchez* and the *Essai historique sur les révolutions*, an attack on the Revolution and the doctrines of perfectibility, which was published in 1797. The *Natchez*, left for years in a trunk in London, at least so the author said, did not appear until long after. So far, Chateaubriand's philosophical attitude had verged on scepticism, and the last chapter of this book was entitled: *Quelle sera la religion qui remplacera le Christianisme?* But his pious mother's grief on reading the book, followed by her death and that of his elder sister Julie, caused an emotional crisis in him: "J'ai pleuré et j'ai cru." As expiation, he wrote the *Génie du Christianisme*, a panegyric of the moral and poetic beauties of Christianity. It appeared in 1802 on the eve of the establishment of the Concordat with the pope, and seemed the justification and consecration of the religious revival. It was well timed and from that moment Chateaubriand was the most famous man in France. He had already won much renown in 1801 by the episode of *Atala*, drawn from the as yet unpublished *Natchez*, and then incorporated in the *Génie du Christianisme*. This was soon followed by *René*, of which the external history was similar.

Napoleon, anxious to win over influential people, appointed Chateaubriand secretary of the embassy at Rome, and then minister to the Swiss Valais. At this moment took place the execution of the duc d'Enghien. Chateaubriand resigned and became Napoleon's fierce enemy. To occupy his leisure, he planned a sort of prose epic in glorification of Christianity. This

was the *Martyrs*, for the preparation of which he made a journey to the Orient, described in the *Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem*. The *Aventures du dernier Abencérage*, published much later, was another fruit of this journey. Chateaubriand again found a psychological moment for his political pamphlet *De Bonaparte et des Bourbons*, and became prominent in politics under the Restoration; he was peer of the realm, ambassador to Berlin, to London, delegate to the Congress of Verona, minister of foreign affairs, and responsible for the war of intervention in Spain, ambassador to Rome. But he never hesitated, with many varying moods, to follow the impulses of his conscience, if that can be distinguished from his vanity: "Bourbon par honneur, royaliste par raison et par conviction, je suis républicain par goût et par caractère." So it came about that after many ups and downs, Chateaubriand faced an old age of comparative poverty, cheered not so much by the solicitude of his wife as by his intimacy with Mme Récamier and by those friends of her *salon* at the Abbaye-aux-Bois who remained faithful in his declining years. He died in 1848. Years before he had begun the writing of the *Mémoires d'Outre-tombe*, intended for posthumous publication as his message to posterity. But much leaked out before his death, and the final piecemeal publication in a newspaper fell flat amid the stirring events of the Revolution of 1848.

Chateaubriand was one of the great *poseurs* and one of the worst liars and plagiarists in literature, but he had qualities which partly justified him, and he influenced his times as perhaps no other man since Rousseau. He is the father of Romanticism and contributes to it a large part of its definite content: "le sachem du romantisme," this portrayer of the Indians has been called. Kindly and sociable in prosperity, yet haughty in adversity, with something of the English reserve acquired by his sojourn in England, suffering from an incurable *ennui* ("j'ai le spleen, véritable maladie, tristesse physique"), he seemed to take pleasure in his gloom; at one exceptional moment, after a

treatment at the baths of Cauterets, he wrote: "I did my best to be melancholy, but could not." Thus he seemed the type of the man destined to be the hero of the Romanticists, burdened with a curse, and drawing after him disaster. The story of René, who stands for Chateaubriand himself, and of the morbid love of his sister Amélie, in whom people recognised the unhappy Lucile, gave rise, under the name of *mal de René* or *mal du siècle*, to the pessimism which stamped itself on the literature of the whole following generation, — a melancholy much more acute than the sentimental meditations hitherto in vogue.

A kindred contribution of Chateaubriand was general emotionalism. This he was far from originating, but he gave it a greater place in literature. His perceptions were almost entirely æsthetic, the reaction from impression. There was little real reflection in his nature. This, combined with his artistic temperament, made his life a series of emotional adventures, and his writings the expression of these experiences, sometimes magnified by the imagination. René wanders through Italy with a "sainte et poétique horreur," Chateaubriand responds in feeling to the majesty of primitive nature at Niagara, to the desolation of the Roman Campagna, to the glory of the Acropolis, the memories awakened by the Holy Land. The journey to America came, of course, at the most impressionable period of his life; it was, moreover, the discovery of a new world to imaginative and descriptive literature. Hence, Chateaubriand is, following Saint-Pierre, the most important author in the development of local coloring, so useful to the Romanticists, and of the communion with nature or conflicts between man and his social environment. As Chateaubriand's imagination roamed over time and space, and he felt the poetry of Gothic art and the beauty of cathedrals, he opened up by the *Génie du Christianisme* the Middle Ages to the dramatists, the novelists and the historians. Finally, by his religious feeling, he inspired his fellow-countrymen weary of the unbelief of the eighteenth cen-

tury and disheartened by the failure of its substitutes for Christianity.[1] Chateaubriand is the counterpart of the influence which in England, as mediæval Romanticism, produced the Oxford Movement, High Church ritualism, and Puseyism. What more specifically differentiates Chateaubriand from many other great writers is that, instead of being a mere mouthpiece for the moods of his contemporaries, he was the leader and instigator.

If we turn to a more direct consideration of the content of Chateaubriand's mind, our praise must be qualified. Intellectually considered, he was not remarkable. Consumed by an extraordinary vanity and the resulting self-assurance that imposes on so many people, he was gifted with a wonderful poetical expression, which found vent in prose, and has put his descriptions among the most beautiful in the French language. Moreover, coming with all their sonorousness and richness of coloring as a heightened contrast to the blank platitudes of a decayed Voltairianism, they were, to his contemporaries, vistas opened into a beautiful world of which persons had never suspected the existence, except in exotic works not accessible to all, like Ossian.

Chateaubriand, as a disciple of Rousseau, was the example of the egoist who saw his life and the world-life as vast heroic poems. Not only is the *Martyrs* a prose epic, but the *Mémoires d'Outre-tombe*, and all the writings where the personal element so constantly enters, are a series of epic scenes of which Chateaubriand is the great hero. He exposes himself in becoming draperies and suitable surroundings to the pity of all people, heedless of the suffering he may cause to the women who come under his influence, his wife, Charlotte Ives, the English clergyman's daughter, Mme de Beaumont, Mme de Custine, Mme de Duras, Mme de Mouchy, Mme Récamier. His life was one of æsthetic self-preoccupation, not taking the form of rigid analy-

[1] The question of the *sincerity* or literary *pose* of Chateaubriand's religious attitude has been the subject of much discussion. See the abbé Bertrin's *la Sincérité religieuse de Chateaubriand.*

sis but merely of vague yearnings and wailings, in which he never lost sight of the stage-setting: he took much thought as to his own burial, whether it should be in a Roman sarcophagus, or, as he finally decided, on a storm-beaten island in Brittany; yet he never knew what became of his sister Lucile's body. In the same way the *Mémoires d'Outre-tombe* are not to be compared with the *Confessions* of Rousseau, since in them Chateaubriand appears only in his best light: "Il ne faut présenter au monde que ce qui est beau."

Taking, then, Chateaubriand's work as a whole, and disregarding slight differences of chronological periods, we may come to this judgment upon his achievements:

He finally swept away the ideals of Classicism in form and content, and substituted for a literature of rationalised generalisations from the reading of ancient authors, a new literature, emotional and passionate, based on individual experience and on new sources of inspiration: the remote wilderness of distant continents or the remote days of past history. Rousseau and Saint-Pierre had pointed the way, but Chateaubriand won the victory. He rescued the French language from inanition and made it poetical and imaginative, bringing into it new figures and similes drawn from a wider field of vision and expressed in a less hackneyed vocabulary. Of the *Itinéraire* he said: "J'allais chercher des images, voilà tout." The "orage de mon cœur, est-ce une goutte de votre pluie?" was to take the place of the "brûlé de plus de feux que je n'en allumai" of the Classical lover. He narrowed, it is true, almost to the one form of *taedium vitae* the outlet of the poet and novelist, but he opened outlooks upon regions where men were seen suffering from the same sorrows. He not only stimulated the study of history, at least in its picturesque aspects, but disclosed the beauty and consoling power of a religion which had been scorned and neglected. There is much that is unnatural in Chateaubriand's nature: there is something theatrical, however chivalrous and even quixotic, in the actions of his own political career; his savages are sophis-

ticated beings voicing his own sentiments, and Chactas in Europe is no untutored barbarian ignorant of civilised feelings. The Natchez or Iroquois of Chateaubriand is as untrue as the Huron of Voltaire or the Inca of Marmontel.

Not least among Chateaubriand's services was to show that the Christian faith need not be considered as either the teaching of knaves and fools or a tool for tyrannical oppression. His nature was fitted for this interpretation and the conciliation of the beautiful and the good: it was Sainte-Beuve who called him an epicurean with a Catholic imagination. Hence in the *Génie du Christianisme* he proceeds, on the principle that "there is nothing beautiful which is not divine," to point out the beauties of the Christian faith, to show the poetry of its dogmas and ceremonies, and the relations of art and literature to religion: Sainte-Beuve calls him also the "avocat poétique du christianisme." And Chateaubriand said himself: "Where Mme de Staël sees perfectibility, I see Jesus." In the *Martyrs* he writes the great Christian prose epic, as the *Mémoires d'Outre-tombe* are the lay epic of his own times, once again reacting against the trappings of Classicism by opposing the *merveilleux chrétien* to the *merveilleux païen* which the school of Boileau had admitted only. So he tells the story of the young lovers in the days of Diocletian, Eudore and Cymodocée, the one a Christian, the other daughter of a pagan priest, whose love ends in martyrdom. He accompanies their tale with semi-historical descriptions and episodes seemingly irrelevant but beautiful in themselves, as in Book VI. The result is a mixture of Homer and Milton, sometimes with Bossuet added, of history and of geography. It is often diffuse and verbose, but it has about it the glow of the sublime rhetorician. It should, however, be remembered that this æsthetic and sensuous glorification of Christianity did not add a particle to its moral strength, and Chateaubriand is the ancestor of those who found their faith not on religion but on religiosity, and to whom rites and ceremonials are the essence rather than the symbol of their belief.

Chateaubriand was a master of the art of writing. To the Classicist and to the unimaginative critic he seems lush, turgid, and bombastic, but to those who are susceptible to the harmony of words and who can visualise the scenes which his imagination called up, Chateaubriand will always be a great name. He was no slapdash writer; many of his passages were rewritten more than once, and some of the extant episodes are examples of overwrought literary method, a pseudo-epic verging on unconscious parody. There is no knowing how much Chateaubriand was indebted to the keen judgment of his faithful friends Fontanes and Joubert: perhaps to one of them was due the elimination of solecisms of taste, such as calling God in the early editions of the *Génie du Christianisme*, the "éternel célibataire des mondes." It was Mme de Beaumont who said, however, and posterity can at least understand what she meant: "Le style de M. de Chateaubriand joue du clavecin sur toutes mes fibres." He was guilty of many lapses from good taste, and was responsible for ridiculous exaggerations on the part of his disciples, and Sainte-Beuve saw to it that these should not remain unknown. But, for good or evil, he was a Titan in his influence, and the time has passed when it is permissible to scoff at him. Not that he was pleased with his literary descendants of the Romantic school: he wanted to remain alone in his glory. Moreover Chateaubriand was, in reality, a traditionalist, and so, opposed to his disciples. His position in French literature is not unlike that of Byron with regard to Pope.

A spirit kindred to Chateaubriand's world-weariness is to be found in Senancour's *Obermann* (1804), though its author was jealous of Chateaubriand and disliked him intensely. Etienne Pivert de Senancour (1770–1846) had many reasons for being unhappy, but he made himself more so. His sensitive youth was darkened by Jansenist family influences, he married unhappily, he was all his life a struggling writer and journalist, lonely, and, as is often the case, valuing least the book on which his fame now rests: for his *Rêveries sur la nature primitive de*

l'homme are less important. *Obermann* can hardly even be called a novel, but in the form of letters, partly describing wanderings through Switzerland and the forest of Fontainebleau, the author pours forth his disenchantment and expresses the premature senile decay of the resolution. What plot it contains is probably in part fiction, in part a revelation of temperament and of feeling, rather than of incident. Yet, none the less, Senancour was not wholly pleased when, after long neglect, *Obermann* was "rediscovered" by leaders of the generation of 1830, like Sainte-Beuve, who wished to republish it unmodified. Only then did it have its true vogue, never a widely popular one. At his death Senancour was a quite forgotten man.[1] Disheartening and discouraging as the book is in itself to read, it is like Constant's *Adolphe*, which it preceded, an important human document and study of a type of mind, more rarely found now but none the less occasionally met, what Philarète Chasles is quoted as calling an "intellectual and moral eunuch." The names Senancour and Obermann are now used practically interchangeably.

Senancour had the temperament of a Rousseau, from whom he got the title of his *Rêveries* and similar egoism. His self loomed large and he magnified his sufferings: "Peut-être quelques jours paisibles me seront-ils donnés: mais plus de charme, plus d'ivresse, jamais un moment de pure joie, jamais! et je n'ai pas vingt et un ans!"[2] He yielded to the cult of sensation, coffee, opium, reaping the corresponding fatigue. Intellectually he had inherited the destructive traditions of the eighteenth-century philosophers (going back beyond them to Montaigne),

[1] Amiel represents among modern writers in French most truly the kindred paralysis of the will. Matthew Arnold has made Amiel almost as well known in England as in France. The type of personal narrative, half fiction, half truth, though with different postulates and environment, may be illustrated by Gissing's *Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft*.

[2] Cf. quotation from Hugo's *Marion Delorme*, p. 701.

including the irony[1] of Voltaire and scorn for the current religion of the people, Catholicism.

Senancour was a man of religious temperament left without a religion, and his struggles were often those between scepticism and religious feeling, as he hopelessly endeavored to create for himself a satisfactory creed, moral and social rather than metaphysical. His inclinations led him to a mystical Spinozistic pantheism, and he found a kindred feeling in Saint-Martin. But everywhere his mysticism left him disquieted, instead of resting, like many moral hedonists and epicureans, in a self-satisfied ataraxy. Thus Senancour is a connecting-link between such opposite tendencies as eighteenth-century philosophism and nineteenth-century Romanticism.

[1] Irony was to Senancour the mark of the superior mind: "Le mépris du *philistin*, l'amour du macabre, le délire métaphysique, toutes choses à la mode dans les ateliers de 1830, *Obermann* en a pu être pour sa bonne part responsable." — J. Merlant, *Senancour*.

CHAPTER IV

THE TREND OF THOUGHT (1815–1850). POLITICS AND RELIGION. ROMANTIC MANIFESTATIONS

THE period from 1815 to 1850 was one of complete reconstruction in all the spheres of French existence. The Revolution had destroyed the old civilisation, and its successor, the Empire, had merely testified to the instability of a substitute. The rest of the half-century was, therefore, mainly taken up by the search for a new balancing principle to maintain the governmental centre of gravity; a new literary expression to replace the exhausted Classicism; new religions and philosophies for the consolation of other generations; and, finally, new schemes for the renewal of society and the happiness of mankind. The period was one of numberless experiments, and many failures. The theories of innovation were, to an important degree, founded on the imaginative impulses ultimately traceable to Rousseau, and corresponded to those which, in their literary aspect, will be studied in a later chapter under the name of Romanticism.

Romanticism is, in truth, in its full conception, much more extensive than is assumed by ordinary historians of literature. Even after 1850 it often merges into Realism, instead of being antithetical to it, as it is to Classicism. It occupies fully as important a part of the nineteenth century as Classicism, the School of 1660, did of the seventeenth.

Romanticism is primarily, as was the case with Rousseau, the cult of the untutored nature, and a writer who exalts the instinctive or, as the psychologist would say, the subliminal self, to the detriment of reason and reflection, is, at heart, a Roman-

ticist. To him the individual "creative imagination" is more important than the general rules of art.[1] After the political upheaval of the Revolution and the assertion of the rights of man in politics and in literature, the tendencies of the Romantic impulsives divided and diverged. Some, especially those interested in the past or future history of humanity or of a people, evolved a social mysticism, partly under the influence of the German pantheists or philosophers of *Becoming* and Flux. The mysticism was often divorced from the Christian faith and became a religion of humanity. To this tendency belonged the socialists and political or moral utopians. The historians sometimes even sank the individual in the mass, as in the poetic vision of Quinet, or endowed the crowd with divine instinct and spiritualised the mob, as in the accounts of the Revolution of Michelet, Lamartine or Louis Blanc. The social and religious humanitarians, such as Fourier, Leroux or Lamennais, were in the same way Romantic visionaries and seers into the future, and the political orators of the Revolution of 1848 were steeped in Romantic lyricism. To these people, the poet was the μυσταγωγός, the inspirer, endowed by nature with the task of leading the

[1] The great Classical critics, like Boileau, admit the necessity of inspiration, though they do not dwell upon it much:

> C'est en vain qu'au Parnasse un téméraire auteur
> Pense de l'art des vers atteindre la hauteur:
> S'il ne sent point du ciel l'influence secrète,
> Si son astre en naissant ne l'a formé poète,
> Dans son génie étroit il est toujours captif;
> Pour lui Phébus est sourd et Pégase est rétif.
>
> — *Art poétique.*

In the above quotation "genius" is referred to in "l'influence secrète" and not in "génie." To the neo-Classicists Genius was an infinite capacity for taking pains, under the guidance of Reason: to Buffon "le génie c'est la patience." To the degenerate Classicists who opposed the Romanticists Genius was the blind observance of the rules, and meant practically no more than "le talent," which can be acquired by intelligent people: "poeta fit, non nascitur."

masses; and so Victor Hugo understood his rôle when preaching in poetry, fiction, or the drama.

The other Romanticists were interested in themselves. It is they who make up the literary and æsthetic movement technically known as Romanticism. We find the extremes of eccentric individualism among the *bousingots* of 1830, who thought that they alone were geniuses and looked down on the *bourgeois* with the contempt of the aristocrat.

The reign of Louis-Philippe is particularly important to the student of literary history, for, as Paul de Rémusat says in his study of Thiers, it was founded on a philosophical, almost a literary, theory devised by men of letters, the *doctrinaires*; its ministers were members of the academies, and power in it came through ability to speak and write. To the English and the Americans it is interesting because so many Frenchmen looked across the Channel or the Atlantic to the homes of free institutions and of democracy, and, in the case of the United States, to a land where church and state were independent but lived in mutual toleration, and where education was free from the interference of authority. The general trend of thought in France was towards liberalism, in which some stopped in the practical "juste milieu" of Guizot, others went on to the construction of democratical or socialistic utopias where they thought they saw liberty. The general social unrest is expressed by one of the famous books of the time, Louis Reybaud's *Jérôme Paturot à la recherche d'une position sociale* (1843), whose hero has aspirations above his abilities, and finally ends at the point whence he had set out.

At the moment of the Restoration of Louis XVIII the opposition was between the returned legitimists, who had learned nothing from the Revolution and wished to restore the old régime in all its force, and, on the other hand, the liberals. These were of different shades, but they all agreed that the class privileges of the nobility could no longer be what they had been. Louis XVIII, though he tried to re-establish many of the gro-

tesque court ceremonies of the olden times, was, on the whole, more liberal than his brother and successor, Charles X, whose reactionary policy brought on the Revolution of July. The ultra-conservative theories were represented by Maistre and Bonald, whom we have already discussed. More militant men of affairs were the comte de La Bourdonnaye, the "white Jacobin" (white was the color of the legitimists), and M. de Villèle. The theoretical liberals were men like Benjamin Constant and Courier. Next to them came the small but influential group of the *doctrinaires* who wished to evolve new theories, and beyond them were the advanced liberals.

Benjamin Constant, the emotional Swiss Protestant, whom we have seen as the lover of Mme de Staël, was in politics the exponent of individualism. In practice he seemed vacillating and inconsistent through those defects of his temperament which made Guizot call him "le plus clairvoyant et le plus impuissant des hommes, qui fera ce qu'il ne veut pas, par ordre de gens qu'il méprise." Yet in theory he was uniformly consistent in proclaiming the rights of the individual. This was perhaps partly due to his magnified self-consciousness which made him see the individual as more important than the environment. Constant was not averse to a strong government, but he felt that personal liberty demanded the right even to practise abuses so long as they did not injure others. Everybody has a right to his opinions and to express them, as well as to act upon his theories without interference from an authority which is so likely to be swayed by arbitrary influences.

The great political pamphleteer was Paul-Louis Courier (1772–1825). However much we may sympathise with a good deal that he said and wrote, it must not be forgotten that Courier was an instance of the *mauvais coucheur*, and man with a grievance. An officer in the army, he practically deserted twice, and this heroic vindicator of the rights of his neighbors and *protégés* was finally murdered by one of them, exasperated by Courier's harshness and overbearing ways. His interest in

ancient literature and his study of the classics of Greece gave a grace and richness to his style which made dignified an otherwise barren method of political hectoring. It was this literary interest which led him to remodel Amyot's translation of *Daphnis and Chloe* and also certain renderings of Herodotus and Xenophon. Embittered perhaps by failure to get into the Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, he posed for the rest of his life as the Cincinnatus of his farm in Touraine, signing his writings "Paul-Louis Courier, vigneron," as though he were one of nature's "noblemen," in contrast with the classes of privileged birth. Anything representing authority made him furious, whether it meant national or local control, king and aristocracy, or the rural constable, the *garde-champêtre*.

Courier's spirit is, therefore, that of the *bourgeois* malcontent, whether he be writing the famous petition of 1816, "Messieurs, je suis Tourangeau; j'habite Luynes," on the nagging persecution by the authorities of insignificant peasants; protesting against the purchase of the château of Chambord as a national gift to the young duc de Bordeaux, or complaining of the attempt to persecute him because of the famous blot of ink which he had made while copying a manuscript of Longus in Florence (*Lettre à M. Renouard*).

Such being the case, what has saved the writings of Courier from being purely ephemeral? The fact that he was a stylist. This chronic grumbler through communication with the ancients had acquired a poetic grace, a vividness of description, a Socratic irony, which transformed vituperation into literature and enable us to read even now about things which have not a particle of real interest for us to-day.

The spirit of political liberalism was also upheld by Manuel (1775–1827) and General Foy (1775–1825), orators famous in their day, but now nearly forgotten.

A different shade of political theory was expressed by the *doctrinaires*. Though few in numbers, the "parti du canapé" because they could all sit on one sofa, and not always in agree-

ment with each other, they exerted great influence by their intellectual power and the dogmatic vigor of their founder. This was Royer-Collard, no less important as a philosopher than as a statesman. The chief members of the group were Barante, the duc de Broglie, son-in-law of Mme de Staël, Camille Jordan, De Serre, until he went over to the party of reaction, and Guizot.

Pierre-Paul Royer-Collard (1763–1845) belonged to a Jansenist family, and carried through life the rigidity of manner which is connected with the austerity of the Jansenists. However, his theories were a little less immovable than the name of *doctrinaire*, with its *a priori* suggestions, might imply. This is partly because he was chronically in the opposition, and his attitude varied somewhat with the political contingencies he was opposing. But the state of mind which he represented and which has given him the name of founder of the *doctrinaires* was the tendency to criticise more than to act, to assume an irritating superiority and independence, to suggest that any policy would be better than the actual one, and to try to solve practical conditions by untried theories and generalities.

In defence of their position it is to be said that their theories were theories only for a while, and they did succeed in putting them into practice. They were innovators in trying to reconcile two extremes, the ultra-conservatives and legitimists on the one hand, and the advanced liberals on the other. Though conservatives in general feeling, they recognised that the Revolution could not be undone, and advocated a government of conciliation, based on a mean between the two extremes. This was the policy which Guizot, the advocate of the *juste milieu*, was able to carry into effect after 1830, when France was under the control of the *bourgeoisie* of Louis-Philippe.

Royer-Collard, though ultimately responsible for this principle of the *juste milieu*, stood for the frame of mind rather than Guizot's concrete manifestation. But he foresaw the advent of the middle classes of which he was the embodiment, and tried

to prepare their coming by advocating reforms in public instruction, while keeping it firmly under the control of the state. As, however, he was for intellectualism in politics and the rule of reason, he was accused of being unpractical. Though an adversary of the old régime, he sometimes passed as a counter-revolutionary, and then, as the times moved faster than he did, he was finally left after 1830 with the reputation of a soured old man.

But to Royer-Collard was in a considerable degree due the imitation by France of English political institutions during the first half of the nineteenth century. The attempt was not wholly successful, because, as M. Spuller points out, the aim was merely political liberty in England, whereas in France the Revolution had emphasised the Rousseau-doctrine of social equality. Consequently, a government like the Monarchy of July, which with an imitation of English parliamentary methods merely substituted the *bourgeoise* for the old nobility as rulers, could only end in the popular uprising of 1848.

It was François-Pierre-Guillaume Guizot (1787–1874), a rigid Protestant, who put into effect the rule of the *juste milieu*. After a famous but interrupted career as professor at the Sorbonne, minister of Louis-Philippe, and ambassador to England, he became in 1840 minister of foreign affairs, and governed France until the fall of the king in 1848. An example of a type which has largely disappeared from authority or influence in France, Guizot stands for the heroic in the old French *bourgeoisie*, which meant, in its best representatives, uprightness of character and a rigidity of temperament which had at least a stoical veneer. As Guizot's wife lay dying, he read to her Bossuet's sermon on the immortality of the soul. Guizot's enemies called him a "reed painted to look like iron," but this was unjust. With all the narrowness of his religion, he had the energy and combativeness of Royer-Collard, his master. The Protestant was the peer of the Jansenist. First in the apparently liberal opposition and then as the leader of the conservative *bourgeoisie*, he

endeavored to transplant to France the institutions of England and the tory republicanism of his much-admired Washington. He emphasised what are so often scoffed at as "middle-class virtues," and aroused scorn by his advice, "Grow rich by thrift and toil," which his opponents mutilated into "Grow rich." But this stress put on material prosperity did tend to weaken in the nation the strong moral fibre that Guizot himself possessed, and led him to rather grotesque inconsistencies: he opposed with all his eloquence the plan of admitting to the electorate lawyers and physicians, the most intelligent members of the *bourgeoisie*, unless they had the necessary financial qualifications.

A more advanced form of political thought was represented by the lawyer, journalist, and historian, Adolphe Thiers (1797-1877). A native of Marseilles, diminutive but lively, and with everything apparently against him, from his small size and southern accent to his unimpressive voice and loose though clear style, Thiers stood for the full acceptance of the result of the Revolution and its application to royalty in a king who ruled but did not govern. Like Guizot, Thiers saw almost everything to admire in the institutions of England, and wanted to adapt them to France. At first they worked practically in harmony. but gradually Guizot became entrenched in toryism and Thiers remained the partisan of progress. Thiers was the practical politician, entertaining, it is true, a certain feeling of conservatism which made him a moderate to the end of his life. Guizot's political career ended in 1848, Thiers's greatest glory was to come after that. Chronologically it is beyond the scope of the present chapter to tell of his part in the opposition under the second Empire, his great services to his country in his old age as the "libérateur du territoire" after the Prussian war, and as the first president of the third Republic. It was the *petit bourgeois* Thiers who, though not an eager republican himself, saved his country from the "reds" of the Commune and the impotent conservatives who unintentionally blundered into the third Republic after the disasters of 1870.

Among the orators of the legitimist cause, the most important was the lawyer Berryer; but, in spite of his eloquence, his name is not connected with any measure of significance to generations later than his own.

The attitude of the French towards religion varied with the explosiveness so often to be found among them. The reactionary position of the government of Charles X caused an outburst of anti-clericalism; churches like Saint-Germain l'Auxerrois were sacked, and it was hardly safe for a priest in costume to be seen in the street. The toleration of the reign of Louis-Philippe showed Lacordaire preaching in his Dominican's robe and working for the re-establishment of the religious orders in France; while, by 1850, under the name of liberty, the Catholics, by the Falloux law, had wrested from the state the monopoly of education and had set up a rival instruction, the "enseignement libre." Meanwhile, to the neo-Voltairians, the semi-secret politico-religious "Congrégation" was the great bugbear, and the Jesuit was the symbol of everything iniquitous. The fashionable attitude in general was one of benevolent indifference, coupled with a manifestation of religion for the sake of good form, and ranging from orthodox faith to vague deism.

Pierre-Simon Ballanche (1776–1847), the "gentle" Ballanche, for years the friend of Mme Récamier, was for a time looked upon by the liberal legitimists as their theorist, and may be considered one of the precursors of liberal Catholicism. But the indefiniteness and incoherence of his mystical ideas prevented him from appealing to any but the small number who could appreciate his symbolic myths. From the eighteenth-century philosophers, Ballanche preserved the idea of progress, which his melancholy temperament led him to think was to be reached gradually by renovation or "palingenesis" through suffering. But Ballanche had no significance to the multitudes who were carried away by Lamennais's *Paroles d'un croyant.*

Félicité de La Mennais, later written Lamennais (1782–1854), is the real founder of liberal Catholicism. He even found him-

self in time carried beyond the pale of his church. He is, also, like Kingsley in England, one of the earliest Christian Socialists. Yet he began by being a fierce ultramontane. His first important work was the *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion*, in which he attacked the spirit of rationalism and tried to base the truth of religion and the proofs of God on the consent of mankind. This doctrine, that truth depends on universal tradition, derived from a revelation and entrusted to a Catholic church, is of course a form of traditionalism. By a gradual evolution, due in part to the policies of the government, Lamennais came to see in it an obstacle to the liberty of the church, and to demand what seemed radical steps, such as the release of instruction from official control, and of the church itself from its shuffling bargain, the Concordat. This was to offend both parties, governmental and clerical. Lamennais gathered about him at La Chênaie in Brittany eager disciples, such as Lacordaire, Maurice de Guérin, and Montalembert, and founded in 1830 a militant journal *l'Avenir* to contend for liberty and to persuade the Catholics to renounce the protection and favor of the state. The result was discussion and dissension among the French clergy; Lamennais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert went to Rome; the Vatican condemned the theories of the *Avenir*. Losing his followers and friends, Lamennais destroyed the effect of his temporary submission, and broke with Rome in which he had lost faith as the protector of the oppressed. He published the *Paroles d'un croyant*, which Sainte-Beuve, a temporary dabbler in Mennaisianism, saw through the press, and is said to have had a larger circulation than any book yet issued in France since the invention of printing. He now went over practically to republicanism and joined with all the anti-absolutarians who made up the party of opposition, including mystics and utopians. Under the Republic of 1848 he was a representative, then during the Empire he withdrew to solitude and melancholy.

Lamennais's hostility to authority is partly to be explained by his combative and domineering disposition which, after

making him reject the power of the state over the church, made him reject the power of the pope. His influence as a writer and teacher rests, not on his ambitious *Esquisse d'une philosophie*, but on the tiny *Paroles d'un croyant*, which preach love and brotherhood among men, as opposed to the present real life, where tyranny and a perverted priesthood thwart the establishment of the city of God.

The *Paroles d'un croyant* are written in imitation of Biblical language, even to the mechanical arrangement. Thus the work might appear to impressionable persons to have the authority of Holy Writ. As literature, its value lies in its poetical prose style, sometimes artificial and mannered, but now and then reaching beauty in descriptions and parables. Lamennais initiated the "apocalyptic" style cultivated by several writers, including Hugo, of the Romantic school, to which school his temperament corresponded.

Lamennais was a great force, but the weight of the whole church was too much for him, and to the orthodox Catholic he is a despised rebel. Yet no person is more important in the religious history of modern France, as the one who tried to unite religion and democracy in place of a scheming temporal power or an ultramontanism. Religion was to spring from the people instead of, as he had at first maintained, from the pope. He is the founder of democratic Catholicism, for Leo XIII later came round to many of Lamennais's views.

Henri Lacordaire (1802–1861), the friend of Mme Swetchine, is one of those chiefly responsible by his preaching for the revival of orthodox Catholicism among the French people of the nineteenth century. After planning at first to be a lawyer, he entered the priesthood and was about to start for America, where he saw the happy land in which church and state lived in independence and harmony. But coming under the influence of Lamennais, he fought by his side for the common aid, until a rupture due partly to the clashing of two strong wills. To make his peace with the church, Lacordaire wrote a refutation

of the theories of his former friend, and soon won a reputation as a preacher, particularly by his sermons at Notre-Dame. Then, in order to have greater freedom than was possible for a subordinate priest, Lacordaire became a Dominican monk, wearing the costume openly, and thus contributing to the return to France of the various proscribed orders.

Lacordaire's aim was to revive Christian feeling in his country, and consequently he relied mainly upon spoken exhortations, improvising with wonderful facility. The printed form is, therefore, of less consequence. He broke away from the conventional sermon, and has, in consequence, been called a Romanticist of the pulpit. In his mouth discourse became a living and contemporary address, instead of a hackneyed tirade in the old moulds. Hence his success in accomplishing what Lamennais failed to do, the popularisation of Catholicism, without going beyond the bounds of orthodoxy. Under the Republic of 1848 he tried unsuccessfully to unite religion and politics, by serving for a time as deputy. But even Lacordaire seemed too liberal for many of those in control of the church in France.

The comte Charles de Montalembert (1810–1870) became the chief parliamentary leader of the clerical party, of the Catholic liberals with Lacordaire, Gratry and Dupanloup. He helped carry through in 1850 the educational law which bears the name of the comte de Falloux. He was one of the opponents of the vitriolic ultramontane, Louis Veuillot, editor of the *Univers*. The Jesuit Père de Ravignan (1795–1858) was an eloquent orator, like Lacordaire, and the bishop of Orléans, Mgr Félix Dupanloup, was a great teacher of the young and one of the first masters of Renan in the latter's seminary days. Frédéric Ozanam (1813–1853), professor and journalist, founder of the society of Saint-Vincent de Paul, a student of Dante, was, perhaps, the truest scholar in the militant Catholic group.

CHAPTER V

THE TREND OF THOUGHT (1815–1850). PHILOSOPHERS AND SOCIOLOGISTS

THE philosophical theories of the first half of the nineteenth century correspond to the political and theological ones and in many respects coincide with them. There were the same three tendencies, conservative, radical, and moderate or *juste milieu*. The ultramontanes in politics, the theocrats in religion were practically the same as the traditionalists in philosophy, and we have seen how Joseph de Maistre, Bonald, and Lamennais in his first period were at one in attacking the rationalism of the eighteenth century (blaming Descartes as the source of evil) and the political upheavals of the Revolution. But the hope of this school to bring all back to God and tradition was largely swept away by the anti-clericalism of 1830.

The moderates or liberals (the term being relative to the two extremes), feeling that the philosophy of the eighteenth century had gone too far in the development of sensualistic, sensational, or materialistic doctrines, tried to return to a more "common-sense" belief and reinstate the ideal or spiritual element which the Condillacists had banished. But they based the moral law on reason and not, like the traditionalists, on theology alone. In politics they accepted the Revolution as a *fait accompli* and endeavored to guide its results in the inevitable reconstruction. Many of them were at heart irreligious and Voltairian, even Louis-Philippe himself, or vaguely deists, spiritual like Rousseau's Vicaire savoyard or philosophical in the wake of Cousin.

Finally, the radicals banished not only theology but all that did not come from the senses. At least they declared that we

cannot go beyond the evidence of the senses. Everything was thus reduced to a physical or, as some said, to a "positive" basis. The ideal of perfection was no longer to be found in a theological or metaphysical New Jerusalem, but in the materialisation of an earthly Utopia. This seemed feasible because the Revolution had shown how easy it was to destroy, while the *philosophes* had argued the perfectibility of mankind, and the Rousseauists held that man is by nature good and needs only to be organised in view of the general welfare. This reasoning left the way open for the justification of all physical impulses, and accounts for the vagaries of some socialists, which conservative society usually calls immoral.

Thus it may be seen that the philosophy of the monarchy of July and of the second Republic was largely social and aimed at the regeneration of humanity, the healing of poverty and of the unhappiness resulting from every social cause, whether a defective jurisprudence or a new and undigested industrialism. By successive experimentation individualism was to be banished in favor of communism or socialism; for the out-and-out socialists did not believe in the indefinite remoteness of perfectibility, but thought it could be enacted now. Where a Solon or a Lycurgus was wanting, a Messiah like Hugo was sure to spring forward from among the poets, convinced that, by the narrative of suffering, humanity could be taught its regeneration.

The moderates or spiritualists take their rise from the teachings of Royer-Collard, whom we saw to be the original inspirer of the *doctrinaires*, though he looked upon Maine de Biran (1766–1824) as the leader in the substitution of spiritualism, attained by the intuitionalism of the will, for the Condillacism of the Ideologists. It was Royer-Collard, the story goes, who, being appointed professor at the Sorbonne when an immature young man without a system, and coming upon a second-hand volume of the Scotch philosopher Reid, used him to refute Condillac with Reid's arguments against Locke and Hume, and to distinguish perception from sense.

Victor Cousin (1792–1867) is the chief philosopher of the idealistic school, which he developed much beyond the teachings of Royer-Collard. He gave to it the name of Eclecticism, because the system purported to be a synthesis of all the truth contained in older methods. Cousin, a street urchin who by a lucky chance was given an education, became in time the despot of French philosophy. He was launched into teaching with the usual insufficient preparation of those days, and as successor of Royer-Collard at the Ecole normale and substitute at the Sorbonne, he taught first a compound in which he united the theories of Royer-Collard on intelligence, of Maine de Biran on will, and of Laromiguière, a moderate exponent of the ideologist school, on sensation. Then falling under the influence of German philosophy, where his slight knowledge of the language obliged him to fill in many gaps by surmise and intuition, he came in contact, through Schelling and Hegel, with Plotinus and the eclecticism of the neo-Platonists as well as with Plato himself, whom he translated. An imprisonment of some months in Germany in 1824 for political reasons consecrated him the apostle of liberalism in his own country, where his courses had already been suspended by a reactionary government. With the advent of the monarchy of July in 1830 he was the accepted intellectual leader. As member of the *conseil supérieur de l'instruction publique*, as director of the Normal School, as chief examiner for the *agrégation* or superior diploma for teachers, as minister of public instruction in a country where the monopoly of education was in the hands of the state, he controlled with an iron hand every professor of philosophy, who had to teach the doctrines of Cousin or lose his position. Eclecticism became practically the official philosophy of the nation and, although the dogma was not specifically imposed, everybody in the "regiment" understood that he had to teach the existence of God, providence, the immortality of the soul, free-will, and duty.

Cousin even practically ceased developing his philosophy,

perhaps unconsciously hoping that it would thus remain a stable doctrine for the conservative *bourgeoisie*, and turned his attention to literary history, especially that of the seventeenth century. His loving cult of certain heroines of the Fronde, notably Mme de Longueville, caused some laughter at the old bachelor. During the second Empire Cousin withdrew from active service. His influence upon his age was not alone that of printed book or administrative decree, because his dramatic temperament made him turn his lectures into oratorical displays, where thronged enthusiastic men and women captivated by his eloquence. His chief philosophical works were courses of lectures, including *Du vrai, du beau et du bien*. In connection with the seventeenth century he brought about the return to the study of Pascal's own version of the *Pensées*.

The eclecticism of Cousin purported to cull from all past philosophies what was valuable in them, for every system is true by what it affirms and false by what it denies, and each one contains a fragment of the truth. The first great distinction between himself and the Ideologists lay in attributing all the objects of conception, as opposed to the mere perception of objects of experience, to the intuition of the reason. This reason, which judged by the test of common sense, Cousin found in others as well as himself, and so he was led to the enunciation of a universal, impersonal, spontaneous reason apart from the reflecting reason. God could be accounted for, not merely by the ontological proof of the analysis of the idea of God himself, but by the necessary connection of cause and effect: the world is necessary to God and God to the world. This God, in so far as positive teachings went, could lend himself to a very wide interpretation. Thus Cousin's religious conception, which his critics charged with suggesting pantheism, could harmonise either with orthodox Catholicism or with the vague deism that does not bother much about dogma, but considers itself Christian because it believes in "God" and morality. Cousin's philosophy was thus, again, a theory of the *juste milieu* and the expression

of the well-thinking middle classes, averse to novelty or exaggeration. It was an easy-going semi-Platonic idealism in which a rather vague Absolute had been reintroduced to replace the chaos which people found in the results of the philosophy of the sensationalists.

Théodore Jouffroy (1796–1842) was a deeper but less constructive thinker than his friend Cousin. He did not possess the engaging eloquence or the commonplaces which serve as vicarious thinking for the middle classes. His restlessness and pessimism, which brought him into religious unbelief and obliged him to substitute chill philosophy for Christian consolation, tended rather to disturb than to attract. It made him appear the counterpart in theory of the Romantic despair or, as he has been called, the René of modern French philosophy.

The radicals, it has been said, did not bother much about God or the absolute, unless it were to replace Christianity by a new religion of humanitarian sympathy, just as the worshippers of reason or Robespierre had established cults during the Revolution. What they did want above all was to reconstruct society. Their experiments were all shortlived, but they are of interest to the student of literature, either through the influences upon them or by their effect on famous writers.

The first of the great French socialists was the comte Henri de Saint-Simon (1760–1825). He belonged to the family of the duc de Saint-Simon, but for various reasons, including his own unpractical life, he spent his last days in dire poverty and even tried to commit suicide. He had served in the American army during the Revolution.

Saint-Simon is the theorist of an aristocratic socialism. His animus was directed against the incompetents of an old feudalism who were trying to regain power with the Restoration. But he was not ready to replace them by the proletariat. He dreamed rather of an aristocracy of merit and wished to found an industrial state directed by science. The state was to respect property and, by national undertakings, to supply labor and a

livelihood to all its citizens. It was, therefore, to be an organised autocratic industrialism to exploit the world by the benefits of intelligently managed association, what Benjamin Constant called an "industrial papism."

Saint-Simon's numerous writings range from the *Lettres d'un habitant de Genève* in 1803 to the *Nouveau Christianisme* of 1825. His views were constantly undergoing modification or he emphasised different features. One of these was religion; for, nothing daunted, he undertook to invent one. But, instead of being based upon idealism, it was the result of the eighteenth-century materialism and was a physicism reproducing the old lay creeds of optimism, progress, and perfectibility, though not indefinite as with Condorcet. To Saint-Simon the universe, including the sphere of morals, is ruled by rigid mechanical laws, and the new religion, banishing the ascetic spiritualism glorified in the Middle Ages, was to be a rehabilitation of body as well as of soul, of material comfort for society. God was humanity in flesh as well as in spirit.

Saint-Simon, though so erratic in temperament, was extraordinarily rich in suggestivity. Not only did he have wild ideas such as a canal from Madrid to the sea, but others which the world has tried to realise, such as the Suez and the Panama canals. And in the hands of his followers Saint-Simonism was destined to have a vogue which its founder never saw.

His immediate followers were Bazard and Enfantin. Under their leadership the school flourished greatly, so that among those who at one time or another dabbled in Saint-Simonism we find the names of Augustin Thierry, Sainte-Beuve, Pierre Leroux, the composers Liszt and Félicien David, Armand Carrel, Jean Reynaud, Ferdinand de Lesseps, and a band of intelligent members of the Polytechnic School. They controlled the *Producteur* and the *Globe* (the latter for a short time after its best days) and boasted of thousands of adepts in different congregations scattered over France.

For the new Saint-Simonism had acquired a semi-religious orga-

nisation. The propagation of the doctrines by lectures tended to develop a hierarchy under a leader or pontiff. The Saint-Simonists became less aristocratic and more communistic in questions of capital and labor, and gave much heed to matters of education. Many of their ideas still remain visionary. Other questions, such as free trade, the enfranchisement of women, and divorce, have become living topics. There is no denying the ability of the leaders who later proved themselves astute financiers. One of the causes of the downfall of the movement was the development by Enfantin of the physical theories into advocacy of sexual promiscuity. A whimsical community was started at Ménilmontant, with singular costumes and still more singular behavior on the part of the Père Enfantin, and awaiting the leadership of a "sacerdotal couple." This was too much even for Bazard, and the Saint-Simonist community disappeared in ridicule.

The materialistic socialism of Saint-Simon had its influence on the Positivism of Auguste Comte (1798–1857), whose philosophy, though somewhat scorned in France, was in England one of the great influences of the century upon thinkers such as John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer. In France Emile Littré, the author of the dictionary, was the chief follower of Comte. That eminent but flighty mathematician, a friend of Saint-Simon, found the germ of his system in the Saint-Simonist theory that the progress of mankind has been from a theological to a positive stage, through one of metaphysical criticism. Comte therefore generalised the advance of all knowledge over the three states: a theological or fictitious, a metaphysical or abstract, a positive or scientific state. Mankind now needs only to deal with this third one. Positivism was also directly connected with ideology and the eighteenth-century philosophism through the influence upon Comte of Gall and Broussais, who reduced the study of the brain to that of a natural phenomenon. Comte, his opponents affirm, rejects the absolute and replaces it by the knowledge of the scientific fact, on the ground

that we can know only the relative; which relative he immediately recreates into an absolute called the Positive.

Comte's new or positive philosophy, freed from theology and metaphysics, is merely a synthesis of the sciences, classified in inverse order of general to particular but at the same time of simple to complex: mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, physiology, and sociology or social physics.

If Comte had stopped at this point his influence on posterity might have been greater. Regardless of the accuracy of his classification, he represents that attitude toward knowledge to which almost all scientific progress is due. Unfortunately for him his temperament underwent, at the age of nearly fifty, an emotional phase or "moral regeneration" in the shape of an attachment for Mme Clotilde de Vaux. This led him to put feeling or the heart above the head, and to create a religion of altruism or the cult of humanity. It had its heroic dignity in interpreting immortality as the memory men leave behind them, but it became fantastic in its ritual and calendar, especially in Comte's mystical apotheosis of Mme de Vaux, his worship at an altar to her memory, and his association of her with his mother and his female cook, as illustrating by his feeling for them three great relations of society: veneration, attachment, and kindness.

The Fourierism of Charles Fourier (1772–1837) is another attempt to reconstruct society on *a priori* principles. He conceived the idea that the law of the moral universe is one of emotional attraction or gravitation, corresponding to the laws of material gravitation in the physical world. The defects of society are due to the fact that the attraction is thwarted by obstacles which men have not attacked in the right way. The remedy is to modify the environment and to give full play to the principle of harmony, which will permit in turn the play of attraction.

Fourier, therefore, advocated social units of agricultural communities, called *phalanges* or "phalanxes," of definite numbers and living in *phalanstères*, in which harmony should reign and in

which free attraction should be observed in every way that could tend to make life pleasing. Fourier naïvely imagined that the attractiveness of an occupation was a sufficient incentive to industry, that virtue was enjoyment and vice pain. This new abbey of Thélème of an ultra-Rousseauist convinced of the goodness of man was, so far, only a misunderstanding of human selfishness, but when Fourier advocated scientific gluttony, or "gastrosophy," and free love, or "phanerogamy," he misconceived the strength or weakness of human passions. None the less his importance must not be underestimated, as one of the first real collectivists in recent times. The sociology of pure Saint-Simonism had been an aristocratic reorganisation of the state rather than the establishment of small individual democratic communities. The views on the relations of the sexes of Fourierists, as well as Saint-Simonists, were the counterpart of the ideas prevalent among the Romanticists as to the omnipotence of the passions.

Fourier's schemes received some shortlived applications, including the American Brook Farm, and his chief disciple, Victor Considérant, more moderate than his master, made an attempt to found a community in Texas in 1852, which finally went to pieces at the outbreak of the Civil War. Another American colonist, but an independent thinker and not a follower of Fourier, was Etienne Cabet, to whom More's *Utopia* suggested the *Voyage en Icarie*, and who tried to establish colonies in Texas and at Nauvoo, Illinois, on the ruins of the Mormon settlement.

The Utopia of Fourier had been more democratic than that of Saint-Simon, but the proletarian ones now came into vogue as a reaction against the reign of the *bourgeoisie* and as a prelude to the democratic revolution of 1848. The speculative humanitarianism of Pierre Leroux (1797–1871), a foe to the official eclecticism of Cousin, author of *De la doctrine du progrès continu* and *De l'humanité*, lent itself most readily to the emotionalism of the poets and the lyrical novelists. Leroux was the leader of

the form of socialism called Humanitarianism. He had passed through Saint-Simonism. Besides economic communism his works advocate political equality and moral "solidarity," including the emancipation of women and the abolition of caste, and he indulged in various pantheistic speculations, based on the current German philosophical influences, of metempsychosis and of palingenesis. To Leroux, anxious to establish morals without Christianity, solidarity is the relation of the ego to other selves in the one universal substance (pantheism), so that in evil-doing the evil-doer suffers the oppression himself. Thus egoism and altruism run into one, for morality depends on the love of self. Theories such as these tended to transform the "religion of humanity" from something practicable into a doctrine unnecessarily hostile to the orthodox, by denying the immortality of the soul and merging man into mankind, with the dissolution of family and property, and kindred bold novelties.

Louis Blanc (1811–1882) was a less rash visionary and almost the only one who saw his schemes officially tried. His chief work on socialism was the *Organisation du travail*, in which he advocated political reform, as necessary to social progress, and the inauguration of national workshops to take the place of private labor. These were tried under the Republic of 1848, but were not a success.

The theories of most far-reaching consequence in their logical form were those of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809–1865), the author of *Qu'est-ce que la propriété?* To this question his answer was that property is theft. This ultra-proletarian advocacy of class war, combined with the theory of the ethical progress of society until government becomes unnecessary, makes the mild-mannered yet virulent recluse Proudhon the practical founder, through the Russian agitators, of anarchism and the gospel of political murder. But it is often unfair to make the actual founders of any of the theories we have discussed responsible for the logical exaggerations to which these were carried by

the disciples. To Proudhon anarchy was merely the absolute justice toward which the world should progressively tend. The reign of this ideal justice makes a law by human ordinance unnecessary. The political anarchists wish to hasten the millennium by dynamite or, at any rate, to destroy existing governments without considering how they can be replaced.

CHAPTER VI

ROMANTICISM

THE last few chapters have indicated the various constituent elements of Romanticism since the days when Rousseau, to use his own words describing Classical tragedy, first transferred the centre of importance in literature from *on* to *je*. We have seen the development of the emotional phase with the advent of sentimentalism from England (Richardson) and from Germany (Gessner); of meditations upon solemn and melancholy topics, such as thoughts among the dead (Gray and Young), or upon the majesty of nature in its wilder aspects (Ossian). We have seen the growth of the elegiac strain in the minor lyricists and second-rate writers, Parny, Bertin, Millevoye, and the development of the early death *motif* of the "pathetic fallacy" of death linked with the dying year. We have seen in Diderot, though he is not usually looked on as an ancestor of Romanticism, the widening of the range of dramatic selection and the declaration of the rights of the *bourgeois* as well as the prince to suffer; in Voltaire even (the bugbear of the Romanticist) the use of melodramatic tricks of stagecraft. We have seen the discovery of new worlds and the cult of local color in Saint-Pierre and Chateaubriand. We have seen with Mme de Staël the classification (so suggestive to the new school and helpful to its development) of nations into northern and southern, and the differentiation, in her book on Germany, of Classic and Romantic poetry, and the use of the actual term "romantisme" to designate "la poésie dont les chants des troubadours ont été l'origine, celle qui est née de la chevalerie et du christianisme." In so doing she was far from anticipating the full connotation of the developed Romanticism which was going to be opposed to

Classicism; for the *art* of the troubadours, at any rate, was impersonal rather than personal. We have seen also how Mme de Staël revealed to the French the anti-Classical attitude of Schlegel and the imaginative literature of Germany, where the new spirit was flourishing in congenial soil. We have seen how Chateaubriand rendered a similar though less necessary service with regard to England, opening the way for the admission of the real Shakspere, of Byron, and to a minor degree, of the Lake School; but more particularly how he intensified the emotions, increasing pleasurable melancholy into deep pessimism, heightening the tones of local coloring, so that Saint-Pierre could say that *he* painted with a camel's-hair brush and Chateaubriand with a house-painter's tool. Finally, we have seen how he widened the appreciation of the Middle Ages and disclosed the poetry of its art and religious aspiration, until the *romances* or ballads of the *genre troubadour* began to seem to the Romanticists strangely superficial and "dessus de pendule," that is, like the hackneyed sentimental groups on old mantelpiece clocks. Such were the chief elements of the new Romantic school, whose members, thanks to a name suggesting a Romance or Romantic origin, felt that they were as truly in line with national traditions as the opposed Classical school, even though their sources of inspiration were English or German.[1]

[1] The term *romantique* was borrowed from the English and is found in French as early as 1675 (cf. *Revue d'hist. litt.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 440), usually as a foreign word: "Romantic," "Romantik," "Romantick." It designated the sentimental and meditative emotionalism induced by the "deep solitudes and awful cells" of the *jardins anglais*, and added something different from *romanesque* which recalled the fantastic adventures of the early seventeenth-century novels. French thus became ultimately richer than English, which has to use "Romantic" in the two senses. See Mornet, *le Sentiment de la nature en France de J.-J. Rousseau à Bernardin de Saint-Pierre* (p. 244), and A. François, *Romantique, le mot et le sentiment en France au XVIIIe siècle*, in *Annales de la Société J.-J. Rousseau*, Vol. V. The words *romantique* and *romantisme*, referring technically to the literary movement, entered the dictionary of the Academy in 1878.

But the combination of familiar elements results in a new compound, and a definition of Romanticism becomes necessary; though in giving it we need not go so far as the contemporary Classicist Duvergier de Hauranne who called it a "malady, like somnambulism or epilepsy." The task is not simple, as historians of literature have found, but many of the definitions amount to the same thing. One will tell you that it is an "awakening of the poetic faculty"; another that it is "a social phenomenon characterised by a tendency to individualism and, therefore, expressed in lyric form"; others, "a renaissance of spiritualism and religious feeling"; others, "an expansion of the ego," that is to say, a literature of subjectivity. Defining it again by contrast with the Classicism it replaces, it is called the revolution of the modern spirit in literature following the political revolution of 1789; or it is said that, as Classicism seeks to express beauty through order, so Romanticism seeks beauty through disorder; that Classicism is the literature of the reason and Romanticism the literature of the imagination; that Classicism represents Man and Romanticism represents Men; or, after Stendhal, that the masters of French Classicism were in their day revolutionaries whom time has justified and classed, so that Romanticism means interesting one's contemporaries and Classicism means boring them with what interested their ancestors. This statement a later writer, Deschanel, expresses by saying that a Romantic writer is "un classique en route pour parvenir" and a Classic author is "un romantique arrivé." Finally, you will be told, with a good deal of truth, that in practice Romanticism was "tout ce qui n'était pas Voltaire." Alexandre Dumas, speaking of the days of Romanticism, says: "Tout le monde était d'accord sur un point, c'est que si l'on ne savait pas encore ce qu'on voulait, on savait au moins ce dont on ne voulait pas." Victor Hugo defined it with delightful vagueness as "le libéralisme dans l'art."

The result of this incoherence of ideals was a miscellaneous host of characters ranging from the sublime to the ridiculous,

an army of men in buckram. The leaders, such as Hugo, took their mission in absolute seriousness and themselves as seriously. Hugo, whose conceit exceeded even that of Chateaubriand, honestly believed that he was indicating the one way of bringing literature back to real life. And the whole mass of young enthusiasts, acting in accordance with a sort of intellectual dichotomy of A and not-A, as sincerely thought that if A stood for Classicism, anything not-A contributed to art. As A, or Classicism, was the only fixed quantity, all the rebels against it felt that their fellow-rebels were kindred inspired souls, even if their genius was unrecognised.

The prophets of the new religion were Sainte-Beuve and Hugo. The former, drawn by the chances of a literary competition to the utterly neglected poetry of the sixteenth century, recognised the kindred lyric inspiration of the previous age and concluded that in Ronsard and Du Bellay were to be found the real ancestors of the modern school. His *Tableau de la poésie française au seizième siècle* is a study of the old literature viewed from this standpoint. Hugo's preface to *Cromwell* in 1827 and, to a minor extent, Alfred de Vigny's preface to *Othello* express the theory of the new poetry, particularly in the drama, for Romanticism is pre-eminently a school of poetry. Stendhal's *Racine et Shakespeare* attacked as a free-lance the old tragedy, the *Globe* newspaper became an impartial mouthpiece of general criticism yet disposed to favor the new writers, and the *Muse française* was the medium of publication for the effusions of the Romanticists.

The chief point of attack of the Romanticists was the Classical tragedy, both because it had crystallised more concretely the theories of the decayed school of reason, and because dramatic success is in France always the most telling form of victory. The colorless and anæmic alexandrine needed toning up by richer rhymes, greater freedom of cæsura, and general sonorousness. The periphrasis had to go and be replaced by the *mot propre* and a more abundant vocabulary. The publication of Chénier's poems in 1819 had shown what could be done to

renovate poetry. The pompousness and factitious grandeur of tragedy, slurring over so many of the disagreeable truths of life, had to be destroyed, and the artificial division into two separate *genres*, tragedy and comedy, had to be broken down. Particularly, the idea was to be done away with that only heroic virtues and vices could be portrayed, embodied in abstract entities labelled with Greek and Roman names. The Romanticists were, then, aiming at greater realism, just as the Realists were to do a generation later in attacking the Romanticists.

Victor Hugo, whose whole view of the world has been termed a sort of Manichæism, a dualism of elements throughout the universe, linked the separate conflicting *genres* by the principle of antithesis. This was what, he said, made the drama. He argued that life, in its multiform aspects, consists of the opposition of the beautiful and the ugly, the sublime and the grotesque. Hugo saw this opposition everywhere and repeated it in a way no less unreal than the mechanical conventions of the old school. He cast every act into a contrast of grotesque and tragic, in doing which he deemed that he was combining Molière and Corneille; he split the characters of his plays into Jekyll and Hyde elements that leave our modern psychological theories of double or multiple personalities far behind. *Notre-Dame de Paris* illustrates the same theory in fiction.

It was in pursuance, also, of the theory of a return to truth that the Romanticists made so much of local coloring in stage-setting and the elaboration of costume. They thought that by so doing they were drawing away from the impalpable abstract to the concrete real. This did not keep them from incessant anachronisms and violations of historical truth. The Romanticists did not, indeed, like their successors, discard all power of selection; but they claimed the right to choose and to group according to the principles of art and of taste, which are, however, variable. The new literature was "the liberation of art."[1]

[1] "Le romantisme est la décomposition de l'art, parce qu'il est la décomposition de l'homme." — Lasserre, *Le Romantisme français*.

Though many of the Romanticists looked on the drama as the flowering of their school, their lyric poetry must not be neglected. The essence of their art is lyricism, and Hugo's dramas have survived to the present chiefly through their lyrical qualities. In the lyric and the elegy the poet was free to lavish his emotions, to pour out his ego, and to arouse the kindred sensibilities of his hearers or readers. The lyric, as the freest of literary forms, could with its rhythms and metres express joy or sorrow, love or hate. So Brunetière, thinking perhaps of Hugo's definition of his own "thousand-voiced soul" as an "écho sonore" of the world about him, calls lyricism the "refraction of the universe through a temperament." What literary form could be better adapted to this school of literary revolutionaries and of individualists?

It is well to remember, with regard to the whole Romantic movement, that in its manifestations it bore very largely on the question of style: the search for realism in language by the use of the *mot propre* and the revival of proper archaisms to reconstruct the local coloring, the experiments in prosody, and many other innovations were all matters of style. The climax of the cult of "plastic prose" is the *Gaspard de la Nuit* of Aloïsius Bertrand (Louis Bertrand, 1807–1841), who spent his life in polishing and repolishing a small volume of prose cameos, which appeared only after the author's death of consumption in the hospital. The later plastic verse of Théophile Gautier, painter turned man of letters, in *Emaux et Camées*, is also the result of Romanticism.[1]

Of course, the enemy whom the Romanticists saw before them were only the Classical degenerates. The social result of the

[1] "En ce temps-là la peinture et la poésie fraternisaient. Les artistes lisaient les poètes et les poètes visitaient les artistes. On trouvait Shakespeare, Dante, Goethe, lord Byron et Walter Scott dans l'atelier comme dans le cabinet d'étude. Il y avait autant de taches de couleur que de taches d'encre sur les marges de ces beaux livres sans cesse feuilletés." — Gautier, *Histoire du romantisme.*

Revolution, the Empire, and the Restoration had been to transfer power from the aristocracy to the newly enriched *bourgeoisie*. Balzac's novels show how money occupied men's minds in those days. These smug optimists, satisfied with their material prosperity, deeming themselves open-minded because they had inherited a cheap intellectual and anti-religious Voltairianism, had in literature kept the cult of the traditional tragedy and looked upon innovation as a curse. The unkempt youngsters of Romanticism heaped the epithets of "épiciers" and "philistins" on this type, which poor unpopular Louis-Philippe, the thrifty *bourgeois*-king, embodied, with his pear-shaped head, his ungainly umbrella, and his timid policy of the *juste milieu:* which Flaubert ("bourgeoisophobus") was to parody in M. Homais, the apothecary in *Madame Bovary;* which Henri Monnier, the caricaturist and author-actor, portrayed in the type of M. Joseph Prudhomme, the ventripotent and platitudinous gold-spectacled citizen, who remarked that "All men are equal except for the differences which exist among them," and made the immortal speech, on receiving a sword of honor as officer of the National Guard: "This sword is the proudest day of my life. If ever I lead your phalanx into action I shall use it to protect our institutions and, if necessary, to combat them." Mayeux, created by the artist Charles Traviès, was more specifically the satire of the small *bourgeois* and tradesman. Thus it may be seen that the *bourgeois* of the Romanticists was merely what we call in English the "Philistine." Said Flaubert, "J'appelle bourgeois quiconque a des façons basses de sentir."[1]

In the early days of the Romantic movement the cleavage between the two parties was not so violently marked. At first there was no strong militant tendency, and the new writers had been content to follow the Catholic and monarchical inspiration

[1] "Gautier soutient [against Taine] que la cervelle d'un artiste est la même du temps des Pharaons que maintenant. Quant aux bourgeois, qu'il appelle des *néants fluides*, il se peut que leur cervelle se soit modifiée, mais ça n'a pas d'importance." — Goncourt Diary, 15 Jan. 1866.

of Chateaubriand. It cannot be too strongly emphasised that early Romanticism was religious and legitimist; the liberals were Classicists. Gradually, however, though Scott remained a healthy Romantic influence, French literature became permeated with what the old school called the virus of Byronism. Byron himself was the resultant of the various Romantic sources from Rousseau to Chateaubriand which have been enumerated, but in repaying the debt to France he added personal characteristics, chief among which were a still more passionate and unrestrained *ennui*, a tendency to rebel against society and every form of the moral law, with unsated libertinism, and a sarcastic irony and irreverence of the Voltairian type. All this won favor in France where, after the murders of the Revolution and the military slaughters of the Empire, the emotions were still keyed to a violent pitch.[1] Though Byron did not create Romanticism, he influenced the Romantic types and turned Romanticism from the conservatism of Chateaubriand to liberalism, then to scepticism and revolt. Moreover, the influence of Byron in France coincides, on the whole, with that of the Romantic school.

By 1824 we hear of the first Cénacle, an informal gathering of adepts of the new art, at the home of Charles Nodier in a

[1] M. Maigron in his book on *le Romantisme et les mœurs* quotes from Maxime Du Camp's *Souvenirs littéraires* (I, 118) a passage attributing the pessimism of the French partly to medical incompetence: "Les peuples avaient été surmenés par les guerres de l'empire, et les enfants avaient hérité de la faiblesse de leurs pères; en outre, les méthodes thérapeutiques étaient déplorables. Broussais faisait école et les médecins ne marchaient que la lancette aux doigts; au collège, pour une migraine, on nous tirait du sang; dans un cas de fièvre typhoïde, en une seule semaine j'ai été saigné trois fois et l'on m'a appliqué soixante sangsues; c'est miracle que j'ai résisté. Les doctrines des Diafoirus de Molière s'étaient prolongées jusqu'à notre temps et ont produit une anémie ambiante dont nous avons tous souffert. Pauvreté de sang, prédominance nerveuse; l'homme tombe en tristesse et devient mélancolique. C'est le spleen, le *taedium vitae*, c'est le dégoût de la vie, c'est l'attitude théâtrale, c'est le désir de la mort."

rather remote quarter of Paris at the Arsenal Library, of which he was curator. There some demi-Classicists were still to be seen, and Victor Hugo was not yet willing to compromise himself utterly. But Soumet, Chênedollé, Emile and Antony Deschamps, Ulric Guttinguer, Musset, and Vigny all met on common ground.[1] The host himself, the kindly Nodier (1780–1844), really belonged to an older generation. He was never anything but a second-rate writer himself, but his extraordinary mass of miscellaneous information and his love for books made him a valuable friend. And even as an author himself, his whimsical and fantastical short stories are pleasing little productions. Nodier was largely responsible for the advent of the influence of Hoffmann, which was felt by Gérard de Nerval and Gautier.

The anxiety of the conservatives was soon aroused, and the lines of battle were drawn up. In April, 1824, Auger in a speech at the Academy warned people against the "literature of cannibals, feeding on human flesh and draining the blood of women and children" [2] and the "hellish poetry which seems to have

[1] The Romanticism at the first Cénacle hardly went beyond the world of pages and *châtelaines*, of noble knights and melancholy hermits, said Sainte-Beuve. English Romanticism, which followed Scott rather than Byron, remained more in this condition, and its sentiment is more characteristically that of the "Keepsake Period" than wild passion. That is why French and English Romanticism get to be very different things, in spite of the English influences on France, where people soon went beyond the *genre troubadour*.

[2] Théophile Gautier gives in *les Jeunes-France* an amusing skit of the old and the new poetries (cf. *Daniel Jovard, ou la conversion d'un classique*):

Before,

Quel saint transport m'agite et quel est mon délire!
Un souffle a fait vibrer les cordes de ma lyre;
O Muses, chastes sœurs, et toi, grand Apollon,
Daignez guider mes pas dans le sacré vallon!
Soutenez mon essor, faites couler ma veine,
Je veux boire à longs traits les eaux de l'Hippocrène,

been commissioned by Satan." Byron, above all, was variously charged with having popularised adultery, homicide, atheism, and melancholy.[1] Romanticism with its vampires and monsters deserved the name which Nodier had already playfully given it of "Ecole frénétique," or the more Byronic one of "Satanic." The chivalric and religious poetry of castles and cathedrals was, under the inspiration of the English poet, transformed into one of despair and of blasphemy, of rebellion against destiny. As in Vigny's *Stello*, man is never wrong, the social order always is. It seemed like the advent of the powers of darkness, of the witches of the Walpurgis-night; all the more so that the heroes of whose deeds the poet sang were noble, handsome and, therefore, tempting. Childe Harold, Lara, Manfred are the models

> Et couché sur leurs bords, au pied des myrtes verts,
> Occuper les échos à redire mes vers.

After,

> Par l'enfer! je me sens un immense désir
> De broyer sous mes dents sa chair, et de saisir
> Avec quelque lambeau de sa peau bleue et verte,
> Son cœur demi-pourri dans sa poitrine ouverte.

The humorous cannibalism of this passage is outdone by the auto-anthropophagy of a private letter by a victim of Romanticism, which M. Maigron vouches for as genuine: "Alors, de rage, j'ai pris ma main entre mes dents; j'ai serré, serré convulsivement; le sang a jailli et j'ai craché au ciel le morceau de chair vive. . . . J'aurais voulu lui cracher mon cœur!" — *Op. cit.* p. 153.

[1] The new school certainly was gloomy. It drew much from the English "School of Terror," where, however, the mysteries often had a rational explanation. Mrs. Radcliffe's novels were translated, and the *Mysteries of Udolpho* had already been dramatised by Pixerécourt (*Le Château des Appennins*), but now the writings of C. R. Maturin came into vogue through translations. Nodier adapted *Bertram*, which Hugo quotes more than once; and *Melmoth*, along with Hoffmann's tales, affected even the Romantic side of Balzac in his fantastic "philosophical" novels of the *Peau de chagrin* type (*Melmoth réconcilié*). Hugo's *Han d'Islande* was influenced by Maturin. Oscar Wilde, the decadent Romanticist of England, in his last days of poverty and disgrace in Paris hid himself beneath the name of Melmoth, but whether there is a direct connection, the present writer cannot say.

of the new literature, and the hero is the "homme fatal" who comes and goes "like the simoom," and can give his own definition as Hernani does:

Je suis une force qui va!
Agent sourd et aveugle de mystères funèbres!
Une âme de malheur faite avec des ténèbres!
Où vais-je? je ne sais. Mais je me sens poussé
D'un souffle impétueux, d'un destin insensé.
Je descends, je descends, et jamais ne m'arrête.
Si, parfois, haletant, j'ose tourner la tête,
Une voix me dit: Marche! et l'abîme est profond,
Et de flamme ou de sang je le vois rouge au fond!
Cependant, à l'entour de ma course farouche,
Tout se brise, tout meurt. Malheur à qui me touche!
Oh! fuis! détourne-toi de mon chemin fatal,
Hélas! sans le vouloir, je te ferais du mal!

Meanwhile there developed a sort of "consumptive school" (*école poitrinaire*) among many Romanticists, in which the gloom of Werther, René, Adolphe, and Obermann took on the pallor of death. Remorse or the mere painfulness of living were supposed to sap the body and cause what the Anglomaniacs called "le spleen." Says Alexandre Dumas in his *Memoirs:* "In 1823 and 1824 it was all the fashion to suffer from the lungs; everybody was consumptive, poets especially; it was good form to spit blood after each emotion that was at all inclined to be sensational, and to die before reaching the age of thirty." The fashion in women changed from the boisterous female of the Staël-Empire type, with noisy language and noisy costume, to the languishing beauty, such as Lamartine found to admire in his consumptive Elvire, dressed in soft vaporous muslins, with fruitful rivers in the eye and weeping-willow curls, known as "repentirs." An example of this literature is to be found in the poems of Sainte-Beuve, who as a young medical student went through his emotional crises and recorded them under the name of Joseph Delorme (supposedly the works of a medical student who died of pulmonary phthisis complicated with heart-disease), but who,

after the frail and pallid sensitiveness of his youth, lived to be the fat *bon vivant* that his later portraits show.[1]

By 1829 the centre of gravity of Romanticism had somewhat varied. Victor Hugo, after considerable trimming, grew to be an avowed Romanticist about the time he wrote the *Orientales*, and was the acknowledged leader of the new or second Cénacle. The mistakes of the Restoration government had alienated sympathy, and the movement, instead of being conservative and royalist, even somewhat aristocratic in membership, was more popular and democratic. The chief members were Vigny, Sainte-Beuve, Nodier, Musset, Gérard de Nerval, Dumas, and artists like Louis Boulanger, the two Dévérias, Delacroix, David d'Angers. There flocked together also a mob of irresponsible youngsters who tried to be bold and bad and distinguish themselves by their eccentricities, as they did at the first performance or "battle" of *Hernani* in 1830.[2] It was necessary, says Théophile Gautier, to be "ruisselant d'inouïsme," to be reeking with the unconventional and extraordinary. Gautier's scarlet waistcoat or pink doublet worn at the first performance of *Hernani* is almost as famous in history as the white plume of

[1] "*Joseph Delorme* popularisait le mélancolique et l'impuissant, le 'taré,' dirions-nous aujourd'hui." — Maigron, *op. cit.* p. 294. It also encouraged what might be called the "School of Decay," the tendency to gloat over disease and bodily corruption, which was to lead to the poem on a rotting corpse by Baudelaire and descriptions quite as bad as the hospital scenes of the Realists.

[2] "Gérard de Nerval fut un des sergents recruteurs chargés de former le bataillon sacré qui devait vaincre ou mourir; à l'atelier de Rioult, il remit six cartes d'entrée à Théophile Gautier: 'Tu réponds de tes hommes? — Par le crâne dans lequel Byron buvait à l'abbaye de Newstead, j'en réponds!' Se tournant vers ses camarades de palette, Gautier dit: 'N'est-ce pas, vous autres?' On lui répondit d'une seule exclamation: 'Mort aux perruques!'" — Maxime Du Camp, *Théophile Gautier*. This story was not denied by Gautier, when told in his presence, but it is evidently an *ex post facto* anecdote based on *Hernani:* cf. Ruy Gomez's invocation to the portraits ("N'est-il pas vrai, vous tous?") in the third act, and the conspirators' scene in the fourth.

Henry IV. This procedure even scared away some of the milder converts to the cult of Gothic and the sentiment of mediævalism.

In the first place, emotions were laid on with a shovel or hearts dissected with a carving-knife. The old topics survived in a still more exaggerated form of gloom, loneliness, despair, nightmare dreams of goblins and incubi, language full of figures of lust, blood, and murder, oaths of "Hell and Damnation." The pessimistic poets thought the world more out of joint than ever. Two of them, Escousse and Lebras, neither twenty years old, committed suicide like silly boys in 1832 because their talents were not appreciated. This lugubrious fashion was intensified by Alfred de Vigny's *Chatterton* in 1835, a portrayal of the poet unable to cope with fate. The play, which was considered so overpowering that the critic Maxime Du Camp fainted away at the first performance, encouraged unsuccessful versifiers to die with one hand on an open copy of *Chatterton*, or to bombard the ministry with petitions for employment backed up by threats of suicide.

In addition to this tendency the Byronic influence took a new twist, and the Don Juan type became fashionable — the ironical unbeliever and wicked deceiver. So lyric poetry and the drama, even fiction, were filled with male and female monsters having strange contrasts of character: profligate men of beauty scattering corruption, and vampire women, treacherous, hypocritical, and faithless, but who, like the courtesans, were attractive because they were not *bourgeoises*. M. Lasserre, one of the recent critics of Romanticism, calls its types: "des forçats sublimes, des paresseux de génie, des empoisonneuses angéliques, des monstres inspirés de Dieu, des comédiens sincères, des courtisanes vertueuses, des saltimbanques métaphysiciens, des adultères fidèles." There were unhealthy memories, too, of Mignon, of René and Amélie, of Manfred, of Byron himself and his half-sister Augusta Leigh.

The rank and file of the new school were, indeed, extraordinary

beings. Their chief desire was to "épater le bourgeois," to scandalise those smug citizens already described, against whom they had vowed an undying hate. They called themselves the "Jeunes-France," and people called them the "bousingots." They wore beards in a beardless age, or flowing hair; they rigged themselves out in extraordinary costumes of bright and varied hues; they scoffed at those who wore collars, saying that the bald crowns surrounded by the linen looked like heads of John the Baptist on the charger. They feigned not to believe in virtue or chastity of man or woman. They announced masterpieces in preparation on the *incommodité des commodes* or "the effect of fishtails in motion on the undulations of the sea." They experimented like ghouls, in drinking from a skull, because Byron was reported to have drunk from the skull of a murdered mistress.[1] Some of them transmogrified their names into grotesque forms with Anglomaniac proclivities (Imbert Galloix died partly of grief because he was not English), so that we get lists containing strange mixtures of true and false: Théophile Gautier, Célestin Nanteuil, Gérard de Nerval (Gérard Labrunie), Pétrus Borel (Pierre Borel) the "lycanthrope," Jehan du Seigneur, Augustus MacKeat (Auguste Maquet), Philothée O'Neddy (Théophile Dondey), Joseph Bouchardy, the "Maharajah of Lahore," Jules Vabre. These were the "flamboyants" and the "savages," but the *bourgeois* were "mummies." [2]

Then there was another type of Byronic Romanticist, "le dandy" or "le fashionable," neatly dressed with some exaggeration of style, pale and melancholy, lackadaisical, but cynical and blasé, and singing of black-haired, brown-bosomed beauties

[1] Cf. *supra*, p. 661, note. See also Musset's satire in *Mardoche:*

Il eût fait volontiers d'une tête de mort
Un falot, et mangé sa soupe dans le crâne
De sa grand'mère.

[2] "Je disais à Théo: De quoi s'occupait-on dans le Cénacle? Il me répondit: De tout, mais je ne sais guère ce que l'on disait, parce que tout le monde parlait à la fois." — Maxime Du Camp, *Théophile Gautier.*

in Venice or Seville. This style was represented by Alfred de Musset: "Miss Byron" or "Lord Byronnet," as he was called.[1] Barbey d'Aurevilly, who did not die until 1889, was the last of the Byronic dandies of Romanticism, with his mottoes "Too late" and "Nevermore."

After 1835 the influence of Romantic poetry in its individualistic form gradually diminished. People tired of the outpourings of the ego, and other interests captured attention. There was a growth of the feeling of solidarity, of *social* liberation. The middle-class virtues got the better of the Romantic aberrations, and Hugo himself bubbled over with the milk of human kindness and sympathy for the poor and suffering. Lamartine tried to carry the ideas into practice. Hugo's play, the *Burgraves*, was a failure, and the genius of the actress Rachel brought back attention to the old Classical tragedies. So we get the brief Classical revival in plays like Ponsard's *Lucrèce* and the short sway of the *Ecole du bon sens*, which has been termed the "lyrisme du pot-au-feu." Pegasus came down to earth and took to drawing the plough. And the Revolution of 1848 gave a last blow to the literature of subjectivity by showing that collective society was more in need of sympathy than were the self-centred emotionalists.[2]

[1] Musset objected to being called a plagiarist from Byron:

> On m'a dit l'an passé que j'imitais Byron:
> Vous qui me connaissez, vous savez bien que non.
> Je hais comme la mort l'état de plagiaire;
> Mon verre n'est pas grand, mais je bois dans mon verre.
>
> — (*La Coupe et les lèvres.*)

[2] It is fashionable at present to "pitch into" Romanticism (*éreinter le romantisme*). M. Lasserre characterises the formulas of Romanticism as: "Ruine psychique de l'individu, eudémonisme lâche, chimérisme sentimental, maladie de la solitude, corruption des passions, idolâtrie des passions, empire de la femme, empire des éléments féminins de l'esprit sur les éléments virils, asservissement au moi, déformation emphatique de la réalité, conception révolutionnaire et dévergondée de la nature humaine, abus des moyens matériels de l'art pour marquer la paresse et la misère de l'invention." M. Maigron is a little less vaguely abusive and more

specific: "Adultères, viols, incestes, débauches, orgies, scandales de toute sorte et férocités de tout calibre, scènes de torture et spectacles d'amphithéâtre, tout ce que l'imagination du plus sombre fabricant de mélodrames peut inventer d'épouvantable et de monstrueux, de répugnant et d'abject, tout cela est diligemment étudié, minutieusement décrit, impudemment étalé et conseillé, ou peu s'en faut, dans les romans à la mode et les pièces à succès." Finally, an extract from *Blackwood's Magazine* for March, 1843, however smug in itself, shows, firstly that these charges are not new, secondly that the reputation of French literature abroad for immorality antedates by many years Zola and the Naturalists: "When any one thinks of French literature, there immediately rises before him a horrid phantasmagoria of repulsive objects, murders, incests, parricides, and every imaginable shape of crime that horror e'er conceived or fancy feigned. He sees the whole efforts of a press, brimful of power and talent, directed against everything that has hitherto been thought necessary to the safety of society, or the happiness of domestic life, — marriage deliberately written down, and proved to be the cause of all the miseries of the social state: and strange to say, in the crusade against matrimony, the sharpest swords and strongest lances are wielded by women." (The allusion, is of course, to George Sand.)

CHAPTER VII

THE POETS

ALPHONSE DE LAMARTINE (1790–1869) was born at Mâcon in Burgundy, and belonged to a family of quality but not of high nobility. He was brought up chiefly at the not distant family country-seat of Milly, except for brief unhappy experiences at the lycée of Lyons and the seminary of Belley. The reading which may be considered as his formative influences included the Bible, Ossian, Rousseau, Saint-Pierre, and Chateaubriand. Later he added to this Dante, Petrarch, Tasso among the Italians, and the chief English poets. By them his poetic doctrine is chiefly inspired.

Lamartine was sent to Italy with a friend, Aymon de Virieu, at the age of twenty-one, to distract him from a little love-affair, but at Naples he had a new experience with a young cigarette-maker, which he afterwards idealised in the story of *Graziella*. On returning to France he served for a time, but without enthusiasm, as an officer in the army.

Lamartine had written various poems in the prevailing fashion of Parny, Bertin, Millevoye, and Chênedollé, but a new emotional crisis came in the form of love for Mme Charles, the poet's Elvire (the Julie of *Raphaël*), the young consumptive wife of an elderly scholar, soon ended by her death, and the effect on him was permanent. She was half a dozen years older than he, but her memory was to him like the thought of Beatrice and Laura, and the recollection of the lac de Bourget in Savoy, where they met, remained imprinted in his mind. His first published volume of poetry, the *Méditations* (1820), was so different from anything then known to French literature that the author

became famous in an hour. He married an Englishwoman, was appointed secretary of embassy at Florence, and in 1823 published the *Nouvelles méditations* and the *Mort de Socrate*. In 1825, after Byron's death, came a conclusion to *Childe Harold*. Soon after, he gave up diplomacy to devote himself to literature, publishing in 1830 the *Harmonies*. His home was at Milly and at Saint-Point, two names intimately connected with his life and writings, but in 1832 he undertook with his wife a lavish journey to the Orient (Lamartine was never thrifty), described in his *Voyage en Orient*. On his return to France he entered politics as an independent, sitting, he said jestingly, "au plafond," but winning great admiration, if not influence, by the eloquence of his improvisation and the nobility of his idealism. In 1836 came *Jocelyn*, which marked the culmination of his talent, as the unkind criticism that the title of his following work, *la Chute d'un ange*, could apply to the author, goes to show. His last collection of poems was the *Recueillements*.

Lamartine did nothing more in verse, but turned his attention to a sort of poetic prose which continued in an almost unending stream, the *Confidences*, *Raphaël*, the *Nouvelles confidences*, and some minor stories. His great opportunity came at the beginning of the Republic of 1848. He had been a consistent opponent of Louis-Philippe and the selfish government of Guizot. He had just published his *Histoire des Girondins*, which helped the new revolution by an idealisation of the men of the older one. When a republic was declared, Lamartine was for a few months the leader of the country, but his moderation was by the radicals considered weakness, and his popularity passed in a twinkling. During the reign of Napoleon III he fell into poverty, and was obliged to support himself by hack work, for which his mind and habits scarcely fitted him. With the exception of the *Histoire de la Révolution de 1848*, his writings were now worthless. The government gave him during his last years the income of an invested sum, but, when he died, Lamartine was already almost forgotten.

This poet may, without much paradox, be called an optimistic pessimist. His general view of life is one of brooding melancholy and loneliness, to which poems like *l'Isolement* and *la Solitude* testify, and of satisfaction in haunting the scenes of vanished pleasure, as in *le Lac:*

> De colline en colline en vain portant ma vue,
> Du sud à l'aquilon, de l'aurore au couchant,
> Je parcours tous les points de l'immense étendue
> Et je dis: Nulle part le bonheur ne m'attend.
> (*L'Isolement.*)

Nevertheless, Lamartine is not, like so many Romanticists, at war with the world. Not only could the beauty of nature be a consoling influence to him, instead of the blind and cruel force that it seemed to Vigny, but he had something of the feeling of Pope that "whatever is, is right." Thus he says in his poem to Byron:

> Ah! loin de t'accuser,
> Baise plutôt le joug que tu voulais briser,
> Descends du rang des dieux qu'usurpait ton audace;
> *Tout est bien, tout est bon, tout est grand à sa place;*
> Aux regards de celui qui fit l'immensité
> L'insecte vaut un monde: ils ont autant coûté!

Lamartine's love of nature is sincere and deeply felt: nature is in harmony with the soul. Not merely did he, as Théophile Gautier said, discover the soul of man by his *Méditations*, but man is to him almost one with his environment. It is not necessary to go so far as to call Lamartine, as has been done, a pantheist, but in many respects he has been truthfully likened to at least Wordsworth among the English Lake poets. To him the whole world is permeated with a spiritual life, which is not God but of which God is the key:

> Rien ne m'explique, et seul j'explique l'univers;
> On croit me voir dedans, on me voit à travers;
> Ce grand miroir brisé, j'éclaterais encore;
> Eh! qui peut séparer le rayon de l'aurore?

The parallel with Wordsworth may be pushed still farther than the action and reaction of nature and the soul. Lamartine, too, was a so-called "philosophical poet," and, like Wordsworth, he was a pseudo-Platonist. The *Mort de Socrate*, one of the most beautiful though not the most original of Lamartine's poems, is largely a paraphrase of the *Phædo* of Plato; and in other poems Lamartine writes on immortality, has his recollections of transmigrations in the past ("L'homme est un dieu tombé qui se souvient des cieux"), as well as presages of the future ideal:

> Lieux où le vrai soleil éclaire d'autres cieux,
> Si je pouvais laisser ma dépouille à la terre,
> Ce que j'ai tant rêvé paraîtrait à mes yeux.
>
> Là je m'enivrerais à la source où j'aspire;
> Là je retrouverais et l'espoir et l'amour,
> Et ce bien idéal que toute âme désire,
> Et qui n'a pas de nom au terrestre séjour.

The *Méditations* are far from being merely communion with nature. Their chief pathos lies in the poems to Elvire and *le Lac*, in which Lamartine invokes the memories of the woman he had loved and lost. The *Nouvelles méditations* and the *Harmonies poétiques et religieuses* added on the whole nothing new to Lamartine's poetry.

Jocelyn was an idealisation of an experience of the abbé Dumont, a tutor of his youth. This long narrative poem tells the love of a pure-minded priest for a girl, Laurence, with whom he is thrown by the proscriptions of the Revolution, and his renunciation.

The *Chute d'un ange*, of no less than eleven thousand verses, and much inferior to *Jocelyn*, was in the mind of the author to form with it part of a great poetic cycle. As a Biblical epic it has fine tirades, but it is too flabby to bear close scrutiny, and its story of an angel who becomes a human being through love of a mortal woman weakens its power. It is, however, an important example of the numerous poems composed by the more spiritual Romanticists on angels of pity and love, which have

sometimes been called the "Seraphic School," as opposed to the "Satanic School" of the Byronians. Lamartine was, indeed, the chief poet of the French spiritualists, who held aloof from the wild excesses of the grotesque authors, and who had their counterpart in the philosophy of men like Victor Cousin. The *Mort de Socrate* was also an expression of this feeling, which took the form of a vague deism and hostility to the eighteenth-century rationalism and the contemporary materialism. A tendency to mysticism was perhaps confirmed by his experience with Lady Hester Stanhope, whom he saw in the Orient, and who predicted to him a great political future, which prediction he lived to fulfil.

The prose writings of Lamartine are pre-eminently lyrical and rhapsodical. In the brilliant descriptions of the *Voyage en Orient* one gets the same glamour as in the best parts of the *Chute d'un ange*. In the *Confidences* and the *Nouvelles confidences* there is an excessive quantity of personal *épanchements*, among which *Graziella* stands forth as the best episode. Transformed from the cigarette-maker into a fisherman's daughter and worker in coral, she is placed in the framework of the Neapolitan bay and its islands. The beauty of that southern landscape is ever recurrent in the thoughts of Lamartine. *Paul et Virginie*, *Atala* and *Graziella* are three very different stories, but they must be read together if one wishes to understand the growth of emotionalism in the Romantic school. The *Histoire des Girondins* is inaccurate and worthless as history or criticism, but its lyrical tone was almost as effective as poetry.

Lamartine's position in French literature and in French history is a noble one. He appears to have been one of the most chivalrous and unselfish men that public life produced in his time. He more than once effaced himself in 1848 when a more egotistical course of action would have brought him glory. He was inspired with a desire to bring about greater happiness to all classes of the nation, yet without so much of the sloppy and unreasoning sympathy of Hugo. He tried to execute the re-

forms of the new Revolution without the cruelties of the first one, and succeeded in abolishing the penalty of death to prevent the possibility of a new Reign of Terror. As soon as Lamartine lost his influence, a decline was visible in the country to political brutality and demagogy.

As a man of letters, Lamartine has suffered most with posterity from his inability to restrain his pen. His poetry, at its best, was dignified and noble, and without the stilted artificiality of the old school; it was clear and limpid, so that each word was a mirror into the writer's soul. Yet there was too much of it, and it was enervating in its softness. No poet has written more graceful and touching lines, no poet has written so much monotonous, mellifluous and meandering metre. In prose, where the writer was relieved from the necessity of rhyme, the stream of placid narrative wearies the nerves. But Lamartine, at his best, whether in a mere trifle like *le Papillon* or discoursing upon the immortality of the soul in the *Mort de Socrate*, was a poet such as France had not had since Chénier, and he was free from Chénier's Alexandrian prettinesses:

> Cependant, dans son sein son haleine oppressée
> Trop faible pour prêter des sons à sa pensée,
> Sur son livre entr'ouvert, hélas, venait mourir,
> Puis semblait tout à coup palpiter et courir:
> Comme, prêt à s'abattre aux rivès paternelles,
> D'un cygne qui se pose on voit battre les ailes.
> Entre les bras d'un songe il semblait endormi;
> L'intrépide Cébès penché sur notre ami,
> Rappelant dans ses yeux l'âme qui s'évapore,
> Jusqu'au bord du trépas l'interrogeait encore:
> Dors-tu? lui disait-il; la mort est-ce un sommeil?
> Il recueillit sa force, et dit: C'est un réveil!
> — Ton œil est-il voilé par des ombres funèbres?
> — Non, je vois un jour pur poindre dans les ténèbres.
>
> (*La Mort de Socrate.*)

Alfred de Vigny (1797–1863) was the truest philosopher of those poets of the Romantic school who aspired to be "philo-

sophical." Belonging to a family of quality and ranking as count, he entered military service in the king's household, in which he served from 1814 to 1828, but rose to be only captain. His promotion was slow because of his solitary and moody disposition. He spent most of his life in retirement, in what Sainte-Beuve called his "tour d'ivoire," writing and publishing little as compared with his contemporaries. In 1842 he entered the French Academy, his reception being marked by a rather brutal speech of M. Molé in welcome. Vigny's works consist of two volumes of poetry (one containing the poems published between 1822 and 1826, the other the posthumous *Destinées* of 1864, with many poems that had appeared separately), several plays (adaptations of Shakespere, and the *Maréchale d'Ancre* and *Chatterton*), his prose writings, *Cinq-Mars*, *Stello*, *Servitude et grandeur militaires*, and fragments of his journal.

Alfred de Vigny belonged to the generation of men disheartened by the disasters which the Revolution had involved, and suffered from the *mal du siècle*. But he never could have been happy anyway. No one seemed born more to the possibility of happiness: brave and handsome, distinguished in letters and known as the "poet-warrior," he could have won any worldly success. But the weight of an inexplicable gloom overhung his nature. His sensitiveness was such that he shrank from his fellows and had scarcely a friend. Yet there was a great difference between the soul-sickness of Vigny and that of Chateaubriand, the creator of René. For where Chateaubriand was purely selfish, Vigny professed to be filled with pity for other mortals in pain, and realised "la majesté des souffrances humaines." Byron was, as usual, a great influence on him, but he softened the curses of *Cain* into the pity of *Eloa*.

Immersed so much in his solitary thoughts, Alfred de Vigny gradually evolved a vague philosophic creed of which his writings are the expression: he was an idealist, but became in time devoid of faith or of systematic belief. To Vigny, the world was full of symbols, and his literary method was usually to exemplify in

some figure a philosophic thought. Thus, a Platonist and a student of Malebranche, as well as an admirer of the stoical Julian the Apostate, he had, under the influence of writers like Strauss, author of the famous life of Jesus, gradually rationalised God, or reverence for God, out of his mind. If God does exist he is a tyrant, the torturer of suffering mortals, whose cruelty can best be met with hate, or with stoical indifference:

S'il est vrai qu'au jardin des saintes Ecritures,
Le Fils de l'Homme ait dit ce qu'on voit rapporté,
Muet, aveugle et sourd au cri des créatures,
Si le ciel nous laissa comme un monde avorté,
Le juste opposera le dédain à l'absence,
Et ne répondra plus que par un froid silence
Au silence éternel de la Divinité.

(*Mont des Oliviers.*)

To Alfred de Vigny the poet is a prophet and a preacher to mankind, but he bears with him in his genius a fatal gift which makes his priesthood a curse to him.

Vigny's chief writings represent the gradual growth of his intellectual moods and his fierce stoicism of despair. The poem of *Moïse* (1822) expressing this loneliness of leadership is, in its sweep of Biblical language, one of the most impressive poems in the French language, if we can forget that Vigny is, in a way, putting himself on a pedestal:

Des tombes des humains j'ouvre la plus antique,
La mort trouve à ma voix une voix prophétique,
Je suis très grand, mes pieds sont sur les nations,
Ma main fait et défait les générations. —
Hélas! je suis, Seigneur, puissant et solitaire,
Laissez-moi m'endormir du sommeil de la terre!

If *Moïse* has about it some of the grandeur of Michael Angelo, it must be confessed that the no less admired *Eloa* strikes one as a *coryphée* of the *corps de ballet* trying to be Michael Angelo too. It belongs to the Seraphic School and antedates Lamartine's *Chute d'un ange*, but its pseudo-Miltonian Satan and its virgin angel Eloa are too soft and dainty, so that the impression is of

an opera more than an oratorio. It is the author's chief poem of pity: Eloa is an angel born from a tear of Christ shed by the tomb of Lazarus. She hears of the fallen angel suffering in the darkness, and out of compassion goes to his help, until gradually she yields to him and falls the victim of Satan.

The other chief poems of Vigny have their symbolic meaning. The *Mort du loup*, though it has as hero a scarcely sympathetic beast of prey hounded by dogs, embodies the lesson of stoicism "souffre et meurs sans parler"; the *Maison du berger* is stoicism softened by pity; the *Colère de Samson* expresses the anger of man betrayed by woman, as Vigny felt that he had been by the actress Mme Dorval; the *Mont des Oliviers* is the cry of revolt against God and the world; the *Bouteille à la mer* is a glorification of science and voices the idea that an author's book is like a bottle cast into the ocean, containing a message for mankind. Of Vigny's prose writings the most important are described elsewhere, but *Stello* and *Servitude et grandeur militaires*, like the poems, are works of disillusion. The former deals largely with Gilbert, Chatterton, and Chénier as types of poets dead before coming to the full fruition of their power. Stello, who gives his name to the work, is a contemporary of the literary pessimists of the day, viewing life with ironical scepticism. *Servitude et grandeur militaires*, of which one of the sketches, *la Canne de jonc*, contains the famous "dialogue inconnu" of Napoleon and Pius VII at Fontainebleau, is the result of the disappointment of Vigny's military career.

Alfred de Vigny, if less worthy of admiration as a man than Lamartine, was the most dignified of the French poets of his day. Though, in the last analysis, his poems are as personal as any outpouring of others, he produced the impression of not speaking of himself. He was also the best composer, in the sense that his poems have a beginning and an end, instead of being like those of Lamartine, inchoate and uninterrupted lamentations which could stop equally well at any given point. Never widely popular, he had many qualities in individual poems which more

successful advertisers, like Hugo, used to greater effect after him (*le Cor*). Perhaps at the present moment Alfred de Vigny, the poet, is appreciated as he rarely was in his lifetime.

Alfred de Musset (1810–1857) personified more than any other man of his time the lyric poet. He did not hide himself from his fellow-men like Vigny, nor did he unite poetry with as many other things as Hugo or Lamartine. His life was one of storm and stress, and his whole existence revolved about love. He was at first the spoiled child of his generation, playing with Romanticism but refractory to it, aspiring to be a philosophical poet because he had done well in his school-studies and could bandy about the important names, jesting in the spirit of the Parisian *gamin* at things held in respect by others, but pardonable in most of his proceedings by the ingenuousness of his wickedness.

Musset is perhaps the most characteristically *French* poet of his century. It is true that he underwent many foreign influences, but he took only what was consistent with the French spirit. The licentiousness of the Italian story-tellers and the cynicism of Byron fell in with the moods of one who was steeped in the eighteenth-century profligate literature of writers like Crébillon *fils* and Voltaire. Polished by a dandylike-manner, the *grivoiserie* of the *esprit gaulois* shows itself in Musset in the flippancy of the *esprit parisien*, which has also become known as the "wit of the boulevards"; for Musset was eminently a city poet, in spite of his second-hand literary descriptions of nature. He posed as a bold, bad man, and tried, like the young Romanticists, to bewilder somebody, in his case to *épater* the Romanticists themselves, to "flabbergast" the professional "flabbergasters." He poked fun at the moon (*Ballade à la lune*) topping the steeple like "a dot on an i," which moon from Ossian to Lamartine had been the hall-mark of sentiment; or he reduced the prosody of Romanticism to absurdity by his metrical flippancy of rhyme and overflow.[1] Meanwhile he

[1] Henri huit, révérend, dit Mardoche, fut veuf
De sept reines, tua deux cardinaux, dix-neuf

feigned a cosmopolitan acquaintance with lands he had not seen, putting Barcelona in Andalusia (*l'Andalouse*), or tried to combine sentiment and sin (*Rolla*), and, above all, to be the weary Don Juan of high life. This was, in part, a Byronic pose, but it was consistent with the *boulevardier* type which it helped to mould.

Then, after he had jested at everything, Musset's turn came to pay the penalty. This runaway from Romanticism which had harbored him and to which, in spite of his admiration for Racine, he really belonged, underwent his emotional crisis. He met George Sand in 1833; they fell madly in love though she was six years older, and these two hypersensitive temperaments experienced the torture of living through the exaggerations and discords of the Romantic passion.[1] They went to Italy; at

> Evêques, treize abbés, cinq cents prieurs, soixante-
> Un chanoines, quatorze archidiacres, cinquante
> Docteurs, douze marquis, trois cent dix chevaliers,
> Vingt-neuf barons chrétiens, et six-vingts roturiers.
>
> (*Mardoche.*)

[1] "L'amour romantique, c'est la religion de l'amour ou plutôt l'amour de l'amour." — Lasserre, *Le Romantisme français*. "Cette conception de l'amour, en son fond véritable, n'est que la passion du 'moi' portée à son paroxysme, l'idolâtrie superstitieuse de la personnalité réduite à ce qu'elle a de plus mesquin et parfois de plus grossier, l'appétit de la jouissance, la forme aiguë, exacerbée, si l'on aime mieux, de l'éternel individualisme." — Maigron, *Le Romantisme et les mœurs*. Cf.:

> O Muse! Que m'importe ou la mort ou la vie?
> J'aime et je veux pâlir; j'aime et je veux souffrir;
> J'aime, et pour un baiser je donne mon génie;
> J'aime, et je veux sentir sur ma joue amaigrie
> Ruisseler une source impossible à tarir.
>
> (*La Nuit d'août.*)

> Doutez, si vous voulez, de l'être qui vous aime,
> D'une femme ou d'un chien, mais non de l'amour même.
> L'amour est tout, — l'amour et la vie au soleil.
> Aimer est le grand point, qu'importe la maîtresse?
> Qu'importe le flacon, pourvu qu'on ait l'ivresse?
>
> (*La Coupe et les lèvres.*)

Venice they were ill, the Italian physician Pagello who cared for them came into their lives and they tried tripartite love. There followed jealousy, reconciliations, and all the storms of Hugo and Dumas put together. Finally, after many months of agony, George Sand's vigorous subliminal *bourgeois*-nature threw off her emotions in an attack of liver-trouble, except as material for abundant literary "copy." Musset's happiness, however, was irretrievably wrecked. Though at first he had been disposed to shoulder the blame for their incompatibility of temperament, he began to feel under the goading of friends that he had been tricked by an unfaithful woman. He sought consolation in debauchery and died slowly as his youth left him. But to the immediate results of the crisis we owe the greatest of Musset's writings and those which make him one of the most noteworthy poets of his age. For though his passions seem impossible to our prosaic generation, yet they expressed all his life and soul. In spite of their defects the four *Nuits* and the *Lettre à Lamartine*, which are the result of the Italian journey, must give their author enduring fame. *Rolla*, written just before the trip to Venice, was as important in its day as an expression of the *mal du siècle;* but, in spite of the beauty of individual passages, the incoherence of its subject and the illogical abuse of Voltaire because a profligate commits suicide in a house of ill-fame after having squandered his money, make the poem somewhat ludicrous.

On the other hand, the poetic dialogue of the *Nuits*, especially the *Nuit de mai*, as well as the later *Souvenir*, contain all the beauties that elegiac poetry can give. The metaphors are incoherent, the thought is often vague, but there is in them a deeper suffering than in Lamartine's mopings, a beauty of language partly drawn from Chénier, partly from Lamartine himself, but really characteristic of Musset alone. The different feelings of gloom, despair, consolation, all pass before us, and we need not be surprised at their effect on a generation less sophisticated than ours, on the emotional temperaments of the French of his time.

It is useless to deduce a philosophy from Musset's writings. His only note is love with its disappointments and sufferings. It is true that his disillusions pass to his religious faith, for which he blames Voltaire and the eighteenth century (*Rolla* and *l'Espoir en Dieu*), so that nothing is left to him but a transformation into seriousness of his early playful cynicism. And in this deeper mood there is the additional strain of limpid and harmonious verse, which is a sufficient rejoinder to the charge that the French have no poetry.

Musset's plays are treated elsewhere. His numerous prose writings include the *Confession d'un enfant du siècle*, also devoted to the affair with George Sand, several graceful *contes* and short stories, and some critical essays, including the satirical letters of Dupuis and Cotonet on contemporary foibles of Romanticism and humanitarianism.

Théophile Gautier (1811–1872), whom we have seen as a leader of the militant Romantic cohorts, deserves a place of his own in French literature. Trained to be a painter, he kept to the end of his life the painter's attitude, the vision of forms and colors. Even his early poems were, except *Albertus*, for the most part less eccentric than those of his companions, and he soon saw the amusing side of Romanticism himself, when he wrote the *Jeunes-France* in prose. During his busy life, often harassed by money troubles, he was a prolific composer of all kinds of literature, grinding out wearily his dramatic *feuilletons* for the newspapers, especially the *Presse* of Emile de Girardin or the *Moniteur*, writing novels and stories in which his sensual nature and his mischievous desire to scare the conventional aroused scandal, describing travels to picturesque lands, Spain, Italy and the Orient, or elaborating his most noteworthy verse collection *Emaux et Camées*, and becoming one of the deities of the new school of poetry, the Parnassians.

Gautier's anti-Classical sympathies led him back to the early seventeenth century, so different from the age of 1660. Not only did he try to rehabilitate some of the neglected authors of

that period in *les Grotesques*, but he wrote the engrossing *Capitaine Fracasse* (begun early but published much later), in which we are shown the adventures of a band of seventeenth-century wandering actors and see the influence of Scarron's *Roman comique*. *Mademoiselle de Maupin*, again, makes us think of the seventeenth-century amazons, travelling over the country disguised as men. It was the work of a stripling of genius (1835) in whom passions were not yet calm, and we need not be surprised that it outraged placid citizens and is still classed as dangerous reading.

Gautier's training as a painter shows itself in his accounts of the lands he visited. There was something Oriental in his temperament, and Spain and Italy stand forth in vivid colors, more truly than Russia, which he also described but less convincingly. The same quality appears in *Emaux et Camées* (1852). Gautier had now developed the theory of "art for art's sake," and each of the fairly brief poems forming the collection is a highly wrought jewel, clearly cut and elaborately polished, sometimes a mere description, but in which the words have the value of pigments. The Goncourts, in their diary, call Gautier "le sultan de l'épithète." The doctrine of art for art's sake was a natural attitude for Gautier to assume, but it was destined to lead to a very different literature from that of the Romanticism amid which he evolved it. It meant no longer license; unfortunately there was no guiding principle as in Classicism, and the result in secondary authors was too often eccentricity. It meant in many writers the scission between art and morality, yet in Gautier, at any rate, it meant the partial objectifying of literature out of the Romantic chaos of subjectivity and emotionalism. For Gautier was less rich in creative imagination or personal feeling than in descriptive fancy.

The antithesis of Gautier was Pierre-Jean de Béranger (1780–1857), who belonged to a slightly older generation and who was the embodiment of the *bourgeois* mentality. Moreover, he dropped the "de" of his name. He devoted himself to the

chanson, and wrote political, sentimental, semi-philosophical and shady epicurean songs, expressing the "lower middle-class" and popular spirit of his age. His first writings brought him into connection with the *Caveau* presided over by Désaugiers. Gradually Béranger took up political topics and voiced the feelings of the partisans of liberty. At first this meant opposition to the Empire and the contrast of a quiet life with the gaudy show of imperialism (*Le roi d'Yvetôt*); later it meant hostility to the Bourbons, restored through the defeat of the French and by the aid of foreign armies. Napoleon was now to Béranger the former leader of the victorious French armies. Still later it meant, under Louis-Philippe, whose advent Béranger had welcomed, hostility to the selfishness of the moneyed classes and appeals to charity, pity for the oppressed and the love of humanity. Béranger is in accord with the humanitarians of his time.

At the first glance Béranger's songs seem thin in substance and flat in expression; their sentiment is now threadbare and their winks at impropriety (*La Gaudriole*) are commonplace. This is the philistine view, recognising only what is philistine in Béranger. He was not a great poet and never endowed French literature with striking phrases, for his language belonged to the tradition of the washed-out Classical school. He may have been a Tyrtæus of shopkeepers, but even M. Calicot could be a patriot.[1] Béranger was thus the leader of the moderately-lettered people in the fight against the political obscurantism of the Restoration and the religious ultramontanism of the Congregation and of the Jesuits, as well as the arrogance of the "marquis de Carabas" of the old nobility. He made the sigh of fond recollection or the tear of sentiment come a little more easily, and cast a little glow of emotion about the memory of an old coat or a yellowing letter or about his old mistress,[2]—

[1] Cf. *infra*, p. 705.

[2] Compare *La bonne vieille* with Ronsard's sonnet to Hélène to appreciate the difference between the aristocratic literature of the sixteenth century and the literature of democracy.

things not very difficult to do; and his ideas did not soar much above an easy-going epicureanism. But his quavering melody was as tuneful as the claptrap stage-thunder of Hugo's humanitarianism. Nor was Béranger a coward: he underwent persecution and imprisonment without yielding from his principles.

Béranger's deity was the "Dieu des bonnes gens." This God was a familiar and undignified individual, quite ready to swear "Que le diable m'emporte," and leniently disposed to wink at lapses against rectitude; consequently Béranger has been charged with materialism and irreligion. None the less, his faith in a beneficent deity was a consistent one, and he saw in God a kindly father, "le bon Dieu," rather than a cruel Jehovah.

The great poets need not make us lose sight of others less famous, even if, like Félix Arvers (1806–1851), they have won immortality by a single sonnet, or like Mme Marceline Desbordes-Valmore (1786–1859) and Mme Amable Tastu (1798–1885), they are but tearful female sentimentalists. Auguste Barbier (1805–1882) is remembered for his *Iambes*, poems of fierce lyrical and political invective connected with the Revolution of July, 1830. Auguste Brizeux (1806–1858) wrote rustic idyls of Brittany. Hégésippe Moreau (1810–1838) was a poet of poverty and suffering; Victor de Laprade (1812–1883) was a scholar poet, yet not a pedant but a philosopher.

CHAPTER VIII

VICTOR HUGO

VICTOR HUGO (1802–1885), far from being of noble origin as he tried to make people believe, was of thoroughly plebeian descent; his mind, instead of being Messianic and big with prophecy, was that of an inflated and conceited *bourgeois*: his language, says Juan Valera in his *Cartas americanas*, was that of a French Gongora. His father was a general of the Empire whose duties led him much about Europe, and Hugo in his youth was at times on the wing, at times living in Paris with his mother and his brother. His parents did not always get on well together, and Hugo suffered from want of consecutive training; when with his mother, he had no training at all. The consequence was that, with the exception of a brief period of preparation for the Polytechnic School, he had no real education. To the very end of his days he remained superficial and inexact, talking of much and knowing little, fond of elaborate and incoherent allusions in his prose and verse, such as impress at first sight but do not stand scrutiny.

The most noteworthy experience of Hugo's impressionable age was a sojourn in Spain, where his father was a military governor. This journey affected more than one of his great writings, such as *Hernani* and *Ruy Blas*, and he would even have us believe that his conception of the grotesque as an element of life was stirred by the sight of the *papamoscas*, the monster who strikes the clock in the interior of the cathedral of Burgos. When still younger he had gone to Italy.

Hugo took to literature at an early age and proved himself an infant phenomenon in the conventional moulds, enough so to

win from Chateaubriand, Hugo maintained, the name of "enfant sublime." Hugo's ambition was to be "Chateaubriand ou rien." He wrote, but did not publish, a first draft of *Bug-Jargal*. Meanwhile, however, Hugo was developing, and his *Odes et ballades*, which appeared in successive collections from 1822 to 1828, marked a tremendous advance along a path of lyrical expression in which Lamartine had opened the way.

Victor Hugo was in his youth a sincere royalist, first of the Voltairian type like his mother, then of the Chateaubriand Christian style. So the first poems of Hugo which have any value are inspired by the personal touch of Lamartine and the Catholic mediævalism of Chateaubriand. To a minor extent, also, the patriotic verse of Casimir Delavigne may be looked upon as a formative influence upon Victor Hugo. But he had already come to his own, and the imagination and vigor of lyrical expression were due to himself and to nobody else. He had seen that the beauty of an ode does not lie in apostrophe or periphrasis, but in the idea itself of the poem. Moreover, he realised the need of originality instead of the imitation of conventional commonplaces. Hugo's success and happiness seemed assured: he was married, decorated, admired by the Cénacle. He had published *Han d'Islande*, and now brought out *Bug-Jargal*.

The new influences, towards which Hugo tended, in spite of his hedging, were now so marked that he took the definite step and became the leader of the Romantic school. With *Cromwell* and its preface, he burned his bridges behind him. In January, 1829, appeared the *Orientales*, in which by a remarkable power of visualisation, built partly on memories of his days in Spain, and partly inspired by the philhellenic sympathies of Europe, he made the Orient stand out in his verse as in a picture, with sonorous rhyme and brilliant coloring. This work practically concludes Hugo's first poetical period, and marks the transition to his dramatic interest. *Marion Delorme* was forbidden by the censor because Louis XIII and Richelieu were thought to suggest the king and the clergy, but in 1830 the victory of

Hernani on the stage marked the triumph of Romanticism. The royalist had, moreover, undergone an evolution: in politics he had become a liberal, in sentiment he harked back to the pomp of Napoleon. The miseries of the Empire were already forgotten, its victories only were remembered, and the monologue of Don Carlos in *Hernani* is permeated with Bonapartist feeling.

In 1831 appeared the novel *Notre-Dame de Paris*, one of his greatest books, yet a belated and grudging fulfilment of a publisher's contract, and the lyrical and personal, more reflective *Feuilles d'automne*. The same year *Marion Delorme* was played, and until 1843 Hugo used the stage as a vehicle for his theories: "Le théâtre est une tribune, le théâtre est une chaire," he said in the foreword to *Lucrèce Borgia*. The other important plays were *le Roi s'amuse*, *Marie Tudor*, *Angelo*, *Ruy Blas*, and finally *les Burgraves*, inspired by a journey to the Rhine which he described in prose. The failure of this play caused Hugo's withdrawal from the stage. The *Chants du crépuscule* had appeared in 1835, the *Voix intérieures* in 1837, *les Rayons et les ombres*, containing the famous *Tristesse d'Olympio* in the strain of Romantic melancholy, in 1840. In both series of works there is a similarity in the underlying principles, but with a different expression, meditative in the poems, militant in the plays; in both kinds of writings the author is influenced by the surrounding philosophical and social tendencies leading towards the amelioration of the nations. Hugo thinks that the world needs preaching to and that the poet is meant to be the preacher. Gradually developing his spirit of humanitarian benevolence, he makes his plays vehicles for a pseudo-philosophical symbolism. The characters represent ideas, their contrasts mean the antithesis of forces or of principles. This, again, explains why they do not satisfy other generations having other ideas.

The failure of the *Burgraves* was a great shock; so was the accidental drowning of a daughter and son-in-law in the Seine.

For ten years Hugo's literary production almost ceased, but his conception of his duty towards mankind led him to take an active part in political life, as a member of the House of Peers. After moving to the support of the Orleanist constitutional monarchy, he became, with the Revolution of 1848, a republican, but rather jealous of his rival poet Lamartine, who had made himself more prominent. As a republican, Hugo favored the return to France and presidential candidacy of Louis-Napoleon. Perhaps disappointed at failure to obtain reward in the shape of a cabinet position, he turned violently against the Prince-President, and at the time of the *coup d'état* he had to flee the country. During the whole of the Empire he remained in exile, even refusing amnesty, first at Jersey and then at Guernsey in the Channel Islands. The motives of Hugo's hostility to Napoleon and conversion to republicanism had been personal rather than political, yet the years of his absence are among the most creditable and dignified of his career. In spite of an ever-growing vanity which made him imagine himself an apocalyptic seer and prophet to humanity, placed on a rock-bound coast in the midst of the raging ocean, like the first Napoleon at St. Helena, seeking to express his misty metaphysics in a foggy symbolism, nevertheless solitude, leisure and communion with nature enriched his literary activity. The megalocephalous Hugo is found in the work purporting to be criticism, called *William Shakespeare*, written to accompany a translation by his son, in which, through his apotheosis of the world-poets as interpreters of God, one may read the name of the author. He himself considered the work the epitome of his philosophy. *Napoléon le petit*, written in Belgium, in prose, and the *Châtiments* in verse, were fierce satirical invective against Napoleon, recalling the spirit of the *Tragiques* of d'Aubigné. The *Contemplations*, on the other hand, are full of beauty. They have their starting-point in the memory of the daughter lost by drowning years before, and exile and loneliness deepened the personal touch of all the poems. *Ibo*, in which the angry bard under-

takes to drag comets by the tail and outroar the thunder,[1] shows that his conception of his mission and his hate of Napoleon have not changed. The culmination of Hugo's genius as a poet is the *Légende des siècles*, a series of epic fragments drawn from the history of humanity. The *Chansons des rues et des bois* were trifling and sometimes undignified.

In prose *les Misérables* tremendously increased Hugo's fame, particularly among foreigners unable to read his verse, and consequently unaware that, to the French, Hugo is a poet rather than a prose writer. *Les Misérables* was a prose epic of modern society thrown into the form of a novel. The characters represent the antitheses dear to the author, the incidents follow each other with the melodramatic claptrap of his plays, the plot affords a vehicle for his sociological theories based on the utopias of the day, and all is drowned in a flow of words. The *Travailleurs de la mer* was a story of the Channel Islands besprinkled with the contents of a dictionary of the Guernsey dialect. *L'Homme qui rit* is impossibly unreal.

After the fall of the Empire, Hugo returned home. He engaged in politics without much success. He published, however, some of his good works: in verse the *Année terrible*, dealing with the disasters of his country, a continuation of the *Légende des siècles* and *l'Art d'être grand'père*; in prose *Quatre-vingt-treize*, which as a novel stands next to *les Misérables*, and the

[1] Je suis le poète farouche,

. . . . .

Le songeur ailé, l'âpre athlète
Au bras nerveux,
Et je traînerais la comète
Par les cheveux.

. . . . .

Jusqu'aux portes visionnaires
Du ciel sacré;
Et, si vous aboyez, tonnerres,
Je rugirai.

Histoire d'un crime, an account of the *coup d'état*, actually composed years before.

The last writings of Hugo, with the exception of the *Quatre vents de l'esprit*, did not add anything to his glory. Nor did numerous posthumous volumes. His death in 1885 was an occasion of national mourning, and his funeral recalled that of Voltaire, — or that of Delille. Then came the inevitable reaction among the critics. But it is generally admitted that he was the greatest French *poet* of the nineteenth century.

Nearly all of Hugo's literary creations may be explained by the principles of antithesis or of distortion, whether by mere exaggeration or by actual modification of form. He can view no object, animate or inanimate, through the whole cosmos without contrasting it with its contradictory or its opposite. The characters of a dramatic poem are put up against each other, young versus old, bandit versus king, hero versus villain. *Napoléon le petit* and the *Châtiments* set forth, throughout, the contrast with Napoleon the Great. Life itself consists, as we have already learned, of the antithesis of grotesque and tragic, the ugly and beautiful, whether moral or physical. The principle of opposition is even carried into Hugo's sentence-structure: "Et Calvin crie: ordure! et Pyrrhon crie: ébauche!" The famous "Ceci tuera cela" of *Notre-Dame de Paris* is almost the algebraic formula of his phrase.[1]

The result of this splitting of everything in two not only produced a mechanical pendulum-like swing of action in the plot of novel or drama, but it also ruined his psychology. The

[1] "Hésiode, Esope, Sophocle, Euripide, Platon, Thucydide, Anacréon, Théocrite, Tite-Live, Salluste, Cicéron, Térence, Virgile, Horace, Pétrarque, Tasse, Arioste, La Fontaine, Beaumarchais, Voltaire, n'ont ni exagération, ni ténèbres, ni monstruosité. Que leur manque-t-il donc? Cela. Cela, c'est l'inconnu. Cela, c'est l'infini. Si Corneille avait cela, il serait l'égal d'Eschyle. Si Milton avait cela, il serait l'égal d'Homère. Si Molière avait cela, il serait l'égal de Shakespeare." — *William Shakespeare.* A seventeenth-century writer would merely have said: "Les plus grands écrivains ont un *je ne sais quoi* que les autres n'ont pas."

characters are either extraordinary mixtures of incompatible traits, or they pass from one pole to another with acrobatic agility. The foulest man or woman, a Triboulet or a Lucretia Borgia, is purified by a single quality, fatherly or motherly love. Moreover, the transformations of character are hidden from us in their operation. Hugo seemed to think the psychological analysis of a mental process (which to Racine would have been the whole play) as improper as a murder *coram populo* to the old tragedians. Don Carlos, in *Hernani*, modestly retires into the tomb of Charlemagne to change his mind, and when the time came for Jean Valjean in *les Misérables* to be transformed, he wept, but, — "Combien d'heures pleura-t-il ainsi? Que fit-il après avoir pleuré? Où alla-t-il? On ne l'a jamais su."

Hugo did not even see the elements of his antitheses as other people do. He looked at the world through a magnifying glass by which everything was enlarged and distorted. Gigantic figures hovering in space, bottomless abysses in mind and matter loom large in his verse, and he thought in superlatives:

> — j'ai pris, ô Lions, dans l'immensité
> L'habitude du gouffre et de l'éternité.

A visit to the Hugo museum in Paris shows how his mind was obsessed by the abnormal and how much he amused himself through life by drawing fantastic castles and giving form to the unreal and the caricatural. Yet, in spite of his exuberant imagination, prone to indulge in buffoonery, Hugo was quite without a sense of humor. His characters sometimes say amusing things, but they do not realise that their actions are sometimes more humorous than their words.

Even if Hugo's vision did not distort objects, he tried to see them as symbols, but looked for the concrete rather than the abstract like the Classicists. The symbols were supposed to be the embodiment of some idea or the incarnation of some passion. He personified metaphors and reasoned through imagery rather than through ideas. One picture calls up another, one image

suggests a part of another, so that the reader is dazzled by the splendor of the kaleidoscope, tricked by the factitious antitheses and specious epithets, bewildered by the extraordinary wealth of vocabulary that no French writer except Rabelais has ever equalled, until he yields unconsciously to the writer's personality.

For this personality dominates all Hugo's writings, subjective or objective, and it was by its vigor that he imposed himself as leader of a school he did not originate, and made himself appear the guide of his fellow-men, when he was really only re-echoing what others had said. M. Faguet points out that his political views were always a little behind rather than ahead of the times. But his physical vitality was extraordinary and his ego dominated the poetry of his time, as he was determined that it should, even though he was a colossus with feet of clay, or what Doudan called a "Michael Angelo in terra-cotta."

The earlier poems of Hugo were not necessarily unveilings of the heart and have little to do with love. The composer was largely engaged in destroying the hackneyed commonplaces of the pseudo-Classical ode, and in treating contemporary incidents in a new prosody; or in writing ballads of the Middle Ages; or, finally, in imagining what would be the beauty of an Orient that he had never really visited. But pseudo-Classical barrenness was in danger of falling into disorderly profuseness of description. In the *Feuilles d'automne* the tone changes to one of greater *intimité*, yet it is to be noticed that this chief of the Romanticists does not become truly personal until after the school is fully formed.

It was after 1830, and particularly at Guernsey, that Hugo's poetry became reflective and elegiac, inspired by his own grief, his communion with the majesty of surrounding nature. It was at Guernsey that his wrath against Napoleon broke out into invective, that he wrote his best work in the epic, that he formulated his creed and enunciated more distinctly the poet's rôle.

To Hugo, as to Ronsard, the poet is the bard sublime, kindled with the enthusiasm of genius, and fitted to preach to mankind

lessons of moral uplifting and of social regeneration. The poet's mission is akin to that of the priest, and his field is much the same, except that he is not bound by the dogmas of a specific religion. Hugo became in time a vague deist, verging on a pantheist: he was constantly preaching God and seeing God everywhere. With extraordinary *naïveté* and vanity, he looked upon himself as almost the creator of a new morality of justice, righteousness and benevolence. His resounding manner makes one forget for a time the commonplaceness of his moral discoveries. He was, in short, the spokesman of a generation still struggling with the problems of scientific progress and convinced, as in 1830 and 1848, that the millennium could be hastened by legislative action and the extension of the franchise. Hugo was an optimist who in youth caught the moral rheumatism of Romanticism. He was the moralist, also, who came near being expelled from the House of Peers for a rather unsavory affair (Mme Biard), and whose memorial in Paris, the museum in the place des Vosges, is as full of souvenirs of Mme Drouet, the actress, as of his wife.

But unfavorable criticism of Hugo must cease when we consider him as an epic writer. His lyric verse, magnificent as it is in its impetuosity and grand imagery, is sometimes blemished by anti-climax, undignified vituperation, uncouth language. But Hugo is unsurpassed in the heroic vein, where gradations are not expected, where the ponderous is more in place than the delicately subtle, where the antithesis runs less risk of being comic, where the dramatic climax is not melodramatic, where the rich imagery and swinging verse carry author and reader along impetuously. The poems *Aymerillot* and the *Mariage de Roland* renew the strain of mediæval chivalry; those on Napoleon I, as *l'Expiation*, show the martial greatness and the disasters of the great figure of the modern epic; others, like *la Conscience*, are not so very far beneath the majesty of Michael Angelo.

CHAPTER IX

THE DRAMA

THE most successful contribution of the nineteenth century to dramatic literature was the melodrama, of which the Romantic drama of Dumas and Hugo was but an outgrowth or a passing phase. The melodrama came partly from the *drame bourgeois* and fought and vanquished the Classical tragedy. As literature in the nineteenth century became, with the advance of democracy, more popular and catered to a wider and proportionately less cultivated society, it was destined to undergo fundamental modifications. Tragedy, appealing only to a minority of educated people, was doomed. The populace needed something else. It wanted to see on the stage other characters than declaiming kings and emperors. It wanted violent emotions and violent humor. It wanted an obtrusive display of moral aphorisms. The play had to be no longer even *bourgeois* but plebeian.

The theory of the melodrama proceeds, then, from that of the *drame bourgeois*, from Diderot, Beaumarchais and Sébastien Mercier vulgarised. The form was affected by certain circumstances connecting it with the old fairs of Saint-Germain and Saint-Laurent. About 1759, Nicolet, a manager of marionnette shows at the fairs, started an establishment in the boulevard du Temple for miscellaneous exhibitions, such as trained animals, rope dancers and the like. Success coming, he got more spacious quarters and brought out ambitious shows, light plays and pantomime-harlequinades, and then vaudeville-comedies, as director of the "grands danseurs du roi." During the Revolution the theatre was known as the Gaîté, and it began, by 1795, to

give, as well as gay plays like *Madame Angot*, more serious and even sombre ones destined to be the melodrama, which by 1809 monopolises the theatre.

The chief rival of Nicolet was Audinot, a hair-dresser turned actor, who began at the fairs. He gave pantomimes, parodying the Italian actors; then, moving to the boulevard du Temple, he organised the Ambigu-Comique for the presentation of *ambigus* or medley-plays of dialogue, song and dance, and substituted children actors for puppets in his marionnette-pantomimes.

Thus the two managers developed and complicated their performances, so that Nicolet, imitating the opera, accompanied the action and gestures of his performers with appropriate musical airs and phrases; and Audinot's dialogue-pantomimes had become elaborate scenic displays. The manners of the two neighboring theatres grew closer, the musical-spectacular performances, not having like tragedy old traditions behind them, developed in accordance with the tastes of the audience and became the melodrama. The melodrama was, then, originally a play free or not from the unities (Pixerécourt was usually careful to preserve them), depending partly for its effect on elaborate scenery and musical accompaniments; free, also, to deal with any sort of adventure in any station of life. It was a lyrical prose drama with music executed by the orchestra in the place of song.[1]

[1] The term *mélodrame* was the designation of a monologue of Rousseau, *Pygmalion*, in 1775, in which the declamation was accompanied by musical measures, and a few other examples followed by different authors, becoming gradually more complicated. (For names cf. Gaiffe, *le Drame en France au XVIIIe siècle*, pp. 237–8.) "Remplaçons les héros antiques par des personnages modernes, tout en conservant la musique de scène, nous aurons le *Mélodrame bourgeois*, dont le premier et curieux exemplaire paraît être *l'Elève de la nature* de Mayeur de Saint-Paul, joué chez Nicolet en 1781. Il ne s'agit plus que de le porter d'un à trois actes, d'en multiplier encore les incidents et les personnages, pour aboutir à *Cœlina, ou l'enfant du mystère*." Meanwhile the historical spectacular pantomime at Audinot's

The audiences of these popular theatres, who had gone through the horrors of the Revolution, required strong entertainment with heavy emotions of pity and fear. Their novels, by Ducray-Duminil or translations of Mrs. Radcliffe, had accustomed them to having their nerves racked. They needed exaggerated language too. As Nodier said, Andromaque's "Je ne l'ai pas encore embrassé d'aujourd'hui" had to be for them, "Je ne l'ai pas encore pressé dans mes bras maternels." At the same time, much as the French of the seventeenth century had turned by reaction after the wars of the sixteenth to the pastoral scenes of *Astrée*, so at the dawn of the nineteenth century, people wanted their horrors tempered by a strong moral strain. It was for such audiences that the authors of melodramas wrote their plays containing the now traditional four stock characters: the hero, the persecuted heroine, the villain and the comic character. The chief of these authors were Guilbert de Pixerécourt (not Pixérécourt) (1773–1844), the "Corneille of the boulevards," Caigniez, the "Racine of the boulevards," Ducange and Cuvelier de Trye. The theatres of the boulevard du Temple became so numerous, and so many were the murders there committed on the stage, that it was currently known as the "boulevard du Crime."

The plays of Pixerécourt more closely approach literature than do those of the other melodramatists, though his aim was to please the pit, and he took his task seriously as a teacher of morality. No greater compliment was paid him than by the man who tried to dissuade a friend from committing a crime by saying: "Tu n'as donc jamais vu jouer une pièce de Pixerécourt?" He took as inspiration the plays of Sedaine and the treatise *Du théâtre, ou nouvel essai sur l'art dramatique* of Sébastien Mercier. For years Pixerécourt poured out a stream of one hundred and twenty plays, of which fifty-nine melodramas, the most successful being *Victor, ou l'enfant de la forêt*;

theatre had the same musical accompaniments. After the two types had coalesced, the music ultimately disappeared. (Gaiffe, *op. cit.*)

Cœlina, ou l'enfant du mystère (both drawn from Ducray-Duminil): *la Femme à deux maris; l'Homme à trois visages; Robinson Crusoë; le Chien de Montargis; Latude, ou trente-cinq ans de captivité.*

Thus the type of melodrama which Pixerécourt represents is a play of rapid exposition and movement, proceeding by the unexpected climaxes which we now call "melodramatic"; it relied on declamation of moral platitudes to evoke tears like the sentiment of its prototypes in fiction ("Vive le mélodrame où Margot a pleuré"); it called for elaborate local coloring, reproduction of historical and realistic details (for which Pixerécourt often quoted authorities); it tried to show the various elements of life, by uniting the comic and the tragic. All these features are to be found in the Romantic drama. The Romanticists, in their opposition to tragedy, really took the melodrama and gave it a literary form, though they made more free with the unities. The beautiful heroine, the melancholy lover, fond of the words "fatal" and "funeste," the villain, the comic character appear in the drama as in the melodrama.[1]

Of course the Romantic drama did not destroy the melodrama; it even proved less long-lived, for the melodrama still is popular. In its simpler form and gradually losing the accompaniment to music, the *melos*, it became in time more violent and less bent on inculcating virtue. Pixerécourt not only denied the obvious connection between himself and the school of Victor Hugo, but lamented that in the genuine melodrama people preferred rape, incest and parricide to sentiments of delicacy and probity.[2]

[1] "Ainsi s'ébauche, peu à peu, le type du niais, qui fera bientôt le plus bel ornement du Mélodrame selon la formule de Pixerécourt, Caigniez et consorts. Nous tenons par un bout la chaîne qui conduit à la préface de *Cromwell*, à Triboulet et à don César de Bazan." (Gaiffe, *op. cit.* p. 480.)

[2] Similarly Brazier, objecting to the Romanticists, said: "Ainsi petit à petit, le vieux mélodrame s'est vu déchiqueté par lambeaux; et en quelques années, il a fallu que les tyrans, les chevaliers, les enfants de cinq ans muets et courageux, les brigands, les vieillards vénérables, etc, cédassent

By 1830 and the days of the Monarchy of July, the popular prose melodrama had become decidedly violent. At theatres like the Ambigu, the Gaîté and the Porte Saint-Martin, where Frédérick Lemaître and Mme Dorval won fame, old-fashioned melodrama in an environment of crypts and castles, of mysterious letters and ghosts, had yielded to a more realistic melodrama placed in modern times, in which the villain became the historical bandits Cartouche or Mandrin (the French Dick Turpin), or the Paris murderer living among prostitutes, or even the Jesuit, against whom political agitation was at that time so great (Ducange's *le Jésuite*). The new leaders of the melodrama were Frédéric Soulié, Benjamin Antier, Anicet-Bourgeois, Théodore Nézel, Joseph Bouchardy, the former member of the Cénacle, Charles Desnoyers. From them the mantle was transmitted to writers like Adolphe Dennery, and finally in our own time to Sardou. Plays like the *Deux orphelines* of Dennery and the *Deux gosses* of Decourcelle still testify to the vigor of the melodrama after Hugo's plays had come and gone.

The chief purveyor of the melodrama of violence was Frédéric Soulié (1800–1847), whose novels were of the same character. A most prolific writer, he delighted in heaping in his plays horror upon horror. The only one which has survived, *la Closerie des*

le pas aux adultères, aux homicides, aux parricides, aux fratricides, aux infanticides, et à toutes les horreurs en *ides*. Le moyen-âge a débordé partout comme un torrent, et au lieu de mes bonnes tirades de mélodrames, bien ronflantes, bien sonnantes . . . au lieu de: Monstre, tu recevras le juste châtiment dû à tes horribles forfaits! . . . Scélérat! apprends que tôt ou tard le crime est puni et la vertu récompensée. . . . Gardes! qu'il soit chargé de fers, et plongé dans un cachot dûs à son rang. . . . Allez, vous m'en répondrez sur votre tête! Vous n'entendrez plus que ces mots: Mignons, compagnons, ma dague, Truands, Maugruants, souffreteux, malédiction! . . . pitié! . . . damnation! . . . Arrière, à la hart! à la rescousse, enfer! . . . C'est tout à fait une nouvelle langue, je doute fort que les cuisinières qui mangent des pommes au parterre, que le gamin qui croque des noisettes à l'amphithéâtre des troisièmes loges, puissent jamais se fourrer ce vocabulaire dans la tête." — *Chroniques des petits théâtres de Paris* (1837).

Genêts (1846) is less violent. It is intended to wring the emotions, but although it presents a world of sin and creates the character of the vampire-courtesan Léona, nevertheless the virtuous foils of vice are sympathetic rather than tedious and the characters still have some life.

The self-conscious parody of this literature stands forth in Robert Macaire, created by Frédérick Lemaître. The *Auberge des Adrets* (1823) was a blood-and-thunder melodrama by Antier, Saint-Amand and Paulyanthe, which seemed too foolish even for the Ambigu audiences until it occurred to Frédérick Lemaître to act in the tone of farce the parts of the two villains Robert Macaire and Bertrand, leaving the rest of the play absolutely serious. The result was one of the famous triumphs of the century, which was continued in the sequel *Robert Macaire*. Here the villain, no longer a beggarly and disreputable murderer, but a prosperous promoter of shady financial schemes, deceiving his victim M. Gogo, embodied the satire of the reign of Louis-Philippe and personified the Antichrist of M. Prudhomme.

The Romanticists with unconscious sympathy turned to the methods of the melodrama, because it seemed to give a wider view over life, and because its methods interested the larger audience of spectators who now claimed to be judges, in place of literary academies. Appeal could no longer be made to the reason, it had to be to the emotions. The wider, also, the range of appeal, the more effect the new political and social doctrines might have. Instead of analysing general passions, as did the Classicists, the Romanticists purported to create sympathy for suffering and to preach humanitarianism and democracy. They often failed to do so, and Dumas hardly tried anything else than to voice rebellion.

Various influences, besides that of Chateaubriand, encouraged an orientation towards the Middle Ages. Some writers of tragedy were cultivating historical plays drawn from the national annals. Lebrun's *Cid d'Andalousie* was a transition play, and Soumet's *la Fête de Néron* was a Romantic treatment of a Classi-

cal subject. Casimir Delavigne's *les Vêpres Siciliennes*, *Marino Faliero*, *Louis XI*, and *les Enfants d'Edouard* were timid but praiseworthy attempts to conciliate the two theories. Meanwhile the novels of Scott caused a furore, and after the publication of Ludovic Vitet's semi-dramatic historical scenes on the Barricades, the Etats de Blois and Henry III, history seemed an essential part of literature. In 1822 some English actors had given performances in Paris, but had failed. Shakespere was hooted as an "aide-de-camp of Wellington." But by 1827, times had changed, and the acting of Kean, Kemble, Macready and Miss Smithson caused a passionate interest in England and English literature. The strongest impulse in the new drama was given by Alexandre Dumas (1803–1870), who, take him all in all, was one of the most important initiators in the dramatic literature of the nineteenth century.

Alexandre Dumas, the son of a mulatto general of Napoleon fallen into disfavor, grew up among many hardships, and, coming to Paris, obtained a position as clerk in a government office. Though without any systematic education, he determined, after much miscellaneous reading, to make his way in literature, and succeeded, partly by his purely physical vigor, in becoming one of the greatest purveyors of imaginative plays and romances that the world has ever seen. He was captivated by Schiller, Byron, Sir Walter Scott and James Fenimore Cooper, as well as by the older dramatists of his own and other lands, from Æschylus, through Shakespere and Corneille, to Goethe and Beaumarchais. The results of all these elements working in his unconventional temperament came forth in his dramas. The devices, the *truquage* of his plays are those of the contemporary melodrama, but Dumas's contribution lay in emphasising certain characters and in popularising certain problems. The glorification of passion and the spirit of revolt against the social laws he shares with his fellow-Romanticists.

In 1829 Dumas's first successful play was acted, *Henri III et sa cour*, written in prose. Based on the chance reading of a

passage in the old memoirs of Pierre de l'Estoile, the play set forth the life of the sixteenth century as background for the story of adultery, which henceforth holds its grip on the French stage. This work is an important link between the melodrama and the Romantic drama. In 1830 *Christine* was given, a new historical drama set in a seventeenth-century environment and developed from an earlier attempt by the author. The murder of Monaldeschi at Fontainebleau by the queen of Sweden is the climax towards which the play is constructed.

In 1831 came *Antony*, a drama of "manners" and not of history. The period is modern, the action sombre, dealing with seduction and murder. The chief character, Antony, is the wild Byronic hero-villain, the volcanic lover, the social rebel. A mysterious but proud foundling, who has grown up with an intense bitterness for his fellow-men, this Satanic charmer stops runaway horses, leads astray the married woman who has fallen his victim, and, when the discovery comes, kills her instead of himself with the thrilling but unreal explanation: "Elle me résistait, je l'ai assassinée!" *Antony*, with its modern setting, is the prototype of the nineteenth-century social drama or problem play.[1]

Charles VII chez ses grands vassaux (1831), written in verse, presents the "homme fatal" in the person of Yacoub the Arab; the "problem" is one of jealousy, by which the woman Berengère is driven to and fro between her husband and her lover, as

[1] "Antony est le prototype de tous les aventuriers, grands débiteurs de phrases, grands dépêcheurs de discours et grands faiseurs de gestes, qui sévissent sur la France depuis cent ans, qui s'emparèrent du féminin pour venir à bout de tout le reste, et en qui d'ordinaire il n'y a rien de grand que l'opinion qu'ils ont d'eux-mêmes. Antony est le héros essentiel du drame moderne." — H. Parigot, *Alexandre Dumas*. The actor Bocage, who created the part, helped to give concrete form to the type. "Sa figure blême, ses sourcils épais, sa charpente osseuse et ses longs cheveux noirs faisaient de lui le plus magnifique 'beau ténébreux.' . . . Chacun voulait copier Antony et ce n'étaient que jeunes gens pâles aux longs cheveux noirs." — Séché et Bertaut, *l'Evolution du théâtre contemporain*.

Hermione in Racine's *Andromaque* between Pyrrhus and Orestes. *Richard Darlington*, of the same year, turns on the revelation that the chief character is the son of the public executioner. *La Tour de Nesle* (1832) caps the climax of the historical melodrama of mystery and crime. Here are gloomy mediæval towers, postern gates, secret panels, ambushes, a criminal queen, corpses flung into the river, flashes of lightning in the storm, and curses.

Angèle (1833) and *Kean* (1836) bring us back to modern times. In the former we have one of the first examples of the man who reappears much in French literature, making his way with the help of women, the type that takes us by the *Monsieur Alphonse* of Dumas the younger to Maupassant's *Bel-Ami*. In *Kean* the author built on the life of the English actor who had died a couple of years before, and whose blend of genius and debauchery seemed to Dumas sublime in its independence of the social law. During the rest of his life Dumas wrote a great quantity of other plays, historical or fantastic, often dramatisations of his own novels, including some historical comedies of merit such as *Mademoiselle de Belle-Isle* and the *Demoiselles de Saint-Cyr*, but those already mentioned are the most significant. Dumas organised the Théâtre-Historique for the exploitation of his style of drama.

Alexandre Dumas was the inspired genius of claptrap melodrama for the benefit of the semi-cultivated audiences, a grade higher than the patrons of Frédéric Soulié. The vigor of his own physical nature would have enabled him to galvanise a dramatic corpse. His sense of the picturesque made him appreciate the best scenic effect. His originality made him, for good or evil, endow the stage with dramatic topics and theses. On the other hand, Dumas's want of discipline led him into what now seem grotesque exaggerations: his mediæval horrors are tawdry to the trained reader, his heroes make us laugh at their curses on the world and their agony heaped up thick: "Demandez à un cadavre combien de fois il a vécu," exclaims Antony when asked how many times he has loved. Dumas was physi-

cally too healthy to feel the pessimism of his characters, and they are as amusing as his own efforts to be pale and consumptive. But in his own day the heroes of his plays swept all before them.

Victor Hugo stands for the most ambitious expression of the Romantic school, endeavoring to strengthen the poetical element and appealing to literary taste rather than to the emotions alone. It is for their lyrical quality that Hugo's plays deserve study today. He was inferior to Dumas in dramatic sense and character analysis, though he uses all of Dumas's tricks: secret doorways, undying hates, poisons, murders, and the accompaniments of stage terror. But his fatal habit of forced antithesis, his lack of a sense of the ridiculous, his fondness for making characters the mouthpieces for theories, prevent the plays from being anything but caricatures of human nature. None the less, *Hernani* is one of the most important historically of French plays, and the "Battle of *Hernani*" marks the triumph of the Romantic school.

Cromwell was not really intended for performance, and so escapes criticism from a dramatic standpoint. It was a sort of chronicle play constructed as a melodrama and aiming to portray manners and customs.

Hernani is an excellent example of Hugo's virtues and vices. It is a beautiful poem and a grotesque picture. It re-echoes impressions received from *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Merchant of Venice*, Byron's *Bride of Abydos*, Scott's *Kenilworth*. The long monologue of Don Carlos, paralleled in other plays, filled with a pompous pseudo-philosophy, is the consequence of Hamlet's "To be, or not to be," stretched to the breaking-point to prove to the Classicists that the new school could do without the confidant of tragedy. The hero is opposed to the "honnête homme" of Classicism as the man of impulse. He is a heroic Mandrin or Cartouche, or even like Fra Diavolo, the famous brigand whom Hugo's father had captured in Italy. By his behavior he makes us think of the character in Dryden's *Palamon and Arcite*:

He raved with all the madness of despair,
He roared, he beat his breast, he tore his hair.

The heroine Doña Sol has absolutely no character, except to worship a lover who bullies her, and to deceive her uncle, who has himself peculiar ideas of his duty towards his king. Yet eighty years after it was written, *Hernani* can still make an audience at the Théâtre-Français weep.

The counterpart of Hernani in *Marion Delorme*, the story of the courtesan rehabilitated by love, is Didier, a Romantic version of Molière's Alceste:

Seul, à vingt ans, la vie était amère et triste;
Je voyageai; je vis les hommes et je pris
En haine quelques-uns et les autres en mépris;
Car je ne vis qu'orgueil, que misère et que peine
Sur ce miroir terni qu'on nomme face humaine;
Si bien que me voici, jeune encore et pourtant
Vieux, et du monde las comme on l'est en sortant,
Ne me heurtant à rien où je ne me déchire;
Trouvant le monde mal, mais trouvant l'homme pire.

In *le Roi s'amuse* Hugo depicted the contrast in the jester Triboulet, degraded by his physical deformity and ennobled by love for his daughter, and that between Triboulet, defender of his daughter's honor, and the profligate monarch Francis I. *Lucrèce Borgia*, in prose, is the climax of the Hugoesque melodrama of terror, filled with incest and murder, but wherein maternal love is the purifying influence in the she-monster's heart. In *Marie Tudor* he transforms the haughty English queen into a woman smitten with love for an Italian courtier. *Angelo* accumulates all the crimes and villainies which could not find place in *Lucrèce Borgia*.

With *Ruy Blas* we return to a drama of higher poetic quality, like *Hernani*, though no less unreal. A Spanish nobleman, to avenge himself on the queen who has scorned him, pushes his valet Ruy Blas at court under an assumed name, until this servant masquerading as a nobleman becomes prime minister

and wins her love. Here the antithesis is between the social ranks, and shows the hopeless love of queen and plebeian. *Les Burgraves*, though containing fine epic passages, was Hugo's dramatic Waterloo in 1843.

The plays of Victor Hugo present an *ensemble* of gorgeous pictures, of magnificent scenery and costume, a swinging and sonorous verse, a series of startling episodes. These unexpected incidents, on which the author relied so much, are precisely what make the chief weakness of his plays: he proceeds on principle, in order to be different from the Classicists, to bring about the opposite of what we should naturally expect from the circumstances. Consequently, his characters are a gallery of exceptions acting as psychology teaches that they cannot normally act. On the other hand, the plot has to be planned with factitious antithesis and clock-work climax.

Historically the plays are interesting today, not as documents concerning the epochs they so signally fail to portray, but because they show us the author's own political attitude voicing his times. A democratic feeling predominates everywhere: the king is invariably corrupt or pusillanimous. Virtue and heroism belong to the lowly, whether outlaws like Hernani or menials like Ruy Blas. The ruler is great only as emperor, in which case the memory of Napoleon is thought of in contrast with the weakness of Charles X or the triviality of Louis-Philippe. Ruy Blas invokes the memory of Charles V, and that same monarch is regenerated in *Hernani* when he steps from royalty to empire:

> Ai-je bien dépouillé les misères du roi,
> Charlemagne? Empereur, suis-je bien un autre homme?
> Puis-je accoupler mon casque à la mitre de Rome?
> Aux fortunes du monde ai-je droit de toucher?
> Ai-je un pied sûr et ferme, et qui puisse marcher
> Dans ce sentier semé des ruines vandales,
> Que tu nous as battu de tes larges sandales?

Of the Romantic dramatists Alfred de Vigny deserves to be taken the most seriously from an intellectual standpoint, though

his production was small. His interest in the English models showed itself in his verse translations and adaptations of the *Merchant of Venice* and *Othello*, the latter played in 1829. An historical prose drama, the *Maréchale d'Ancre*, of which the scene was laid in the early seventeenth century, failed to draw, but *Chatterton* (1835) marks one of the great dates in the history of the French stage. This was an emotional play modernised and relieved of its pageantry. Vigny's own words on the plot are: "C'est l'histoire d'un homme qui écrit une lettre le matin et qui attend la réponse jusqu'au soir; elle arrive et le tue.— Mais ici l'action morale est tout. . . . Le Poète était tout pour moi; Chatterton n'était qu'un nom d'homme." Vigny portrays a sensitive poet unable to meet an unsympathetic fortune and driven to suicide because he cannot degrade himself to a menial position. He is the embodiment of the author's own sentimentality; or, as the hero of the play expresses it: "Les hommes d'imagination sont éternellement crucifiés; le sarcasme et la misère sont les clous de leur croix." *Chatterton* is also a drama of unhappy love, but this love is vastly different from the turbulent passions depicted by Dumas and Hugo.

The year of the failure of Hugo's *Burgraves* saw the success of *Lucrèce* by François Ponsard (1814–1867), marking the short-lived victory of the "école du bon sens." Theatre-goers, tired of the tawdriness and bombast of most of the Romantic plays, thought that Ponsard was restoring the old Classical qualities without the wooden conventions. For that reason they applauded as simplicity and purity what was mainly a colorless style. *Lucrèce* owed its success to its opportuneness, and much the same can be said of Ponsard's other serious dramas, *Agnès de Méranie* (1846) and *Charlotte Corday* (1850).

The Romantic drama does not monopolise the theatre, and comedy escapes to a fair degree its control. Scribe, though he composed many plays and operas with the pseudo-historical plots dear to the Romanticists, was the embodiment of the *bourgeois* spirit. The vaudeville enjoyed high favor under the

form of a gay comedy slightly satirical, interspersed with brief songs set to popular tunes. Nearly all the important writers of light plays produced vaudevilles, from Désaugiers the song writer to Scribe. By the side of the vaudeville there were two other chief types, the light comedy of manners in prose and the elaborate comedy in verse. The latter was the goal of a writer's ambition, but it was more artificial and less realistic. For that reason it gradually died out, though it is fairly popular up to the middle of the century.

It is frequently overlooked that this early comedy was often as daring as the realistic comedy of the later nineteenth century. Here, again, the dominating influence of Scribe and the fact that his theatre was, on the whole, proper, or skilled in skimming over danger spots, make us forget that writers even then shocked the *bourgeois*. It is true that the reserve of language was greater. But we see the young husband tricking his rich and elderly wife (*le Jeune mari* of Mazères), the satire of Christian chastity (*le Presbytère* of Casimir Bonjour), love screened by the mask of a third character (*le Chandelier* of Musset), adultery in George Sand, who was partly responsible for the increased vogue of that subject in the drama. Finally, many writers (the novelists were as guilty) liked to portray the corrupt and semi-tragic side of Parisian life, thus anticipating one of the chief devices of the following and more notorious generation of writers.

Casimir Delavigne (1793–1843), in comedy as in tragedy, was cautious and safe. His best play in the light vein was *l'Ecole des vieillards* belonging to the series of "Schools" inaugurated by Molière, in which the old husband's honor, jeopardised by the young wife's lover, is finally triumphant. Mazères, Empis, with poorly written but dramatic plays, and Casimir Bonjour, with more ambitious ones in verse, won numerous successes; Wafflard and Fulgence are rescued from oblivion by a single comedy, *le Voyage à Dieppe*, which still holds the boards; Théodore Leclercq wrote graceful little "proverbs" which influenced Musset. But the most famous was Scribe.

Eugène Scribe (1791–1861) was as prolific, alone or in collaboration, as the Lope de Vegas or the Hardys of previous centuries, and his productions were to be counted by the hundreds. He began with vaudevilles, he continued with comic operas (*Fra Diavolo*) and comedies of incident, or with grand opera (*les Huguenots*) and historical or social comedies.

Scribe was devoid of literary skill and he purposely subordinated style to dramatic action. He had no general ideas except the everyday morality of the class he represented. But he was more gifted than any other writer with the sense of theatrical effect. He was unequalled in finding solutions to apparently insoluble problems. He seems old-fashioned today chiefly because writers since his time have become more cynical and *blasés*, making Scribe appear in comparison ingenuous. But he created one enduring type in the linen-draper's assistant M. Calicot, aping military ways and costume, in a play which nearly caused him to be mobbed by the angry prototypes. In *Bertrand et Raton* he represents the political intrigues of his time; in *le Verre d'eau*, an historical comedy, he shows important results produced by a trifle, an overturned glass of water; *Adrienne Lecouvreur*, with Legouvé, still draws tears by its sentiment; *Bataille de dames*, with Legouvé, is an example of brisk dialogue and quick action. But, none the less, the plays of Scribe best remembered today are those operas and comic operas which owe their fame [illegible] to the composer; as, besides those already mentioned, *la Dame blanche*, *la Muette de Portici*, *la Favorite*, *Robert le Diable*, *le Châlet*, *la Juive*, *le Domino noir*, *le Prophète*.

Scribe is the embodiment of the self-satisfied materialism of the reign of Louis-Philippe. Honor and bravery meet their immediate reward in the hard cash of a rich marriage; the scene is the world of *bourgeois* mediocrity, in which the heroine is the fluttering-hearted, brainless *ingénue*.

Alfred de Musset's comedies appeal vastly more to the student of literature, though they never had the popular success of Scribe's plays and were not originally written with the object of

performance in view. Musset's first play in 1830, *la Nuit vénitienne*, was a failure, and in his discomfiture, he concluded to write only plays to be read, as in an armchair, the *Spectacle dans un fauteuil*. Here he was free from conventions and the restrictions of time and space. He followed the same plan throughout his prose *Comédies et proverbes*, and it was only by the enterprise of the actress Mme Allan-Despréaux that Musset's plays saw the footlights, some of them twenty years after their composition.

An example of the purely fanciful in Musset is *A quoi rêvent les jeunes filles*, in which Shakspere and Marivaux are blown together into a soap-bubble. The comedy shows the awakening of love in the souls of the young twins Ninon and Ninette and the efforts of their sentimental father to give them a taste of romance before their humdrum life begins. In his masterpiece, *On ne badine pas avec l'amour*, which was influenced by the bitter experience with George Sand, we are shown the tragedy of love and the retribution which comes to those who trifle with it. The sombre side is contrasted with the fantastic characters of pedantic tutor, shrewish governess and drunken parish-priest, as well as by the fanciful comments of the villagers acting the part of an ancient chorus. These plays are alien from the American mind, but are full of beauty. Musset's attempt at a Hamlet-play is *Lorenzaccio*, wherein the youth ambitious to liberate Florence from its tyrant, first shares his vices, the better to control him, until at last these vices cling to himself. *Il ne faut jurer de rien* is again pure *marivaudage* and *Un caprice* pure wit.

There are plenty of other plays by Musset of unequal value. *Fantasio*, *le Chandelier*, *Il faut qu'une porte soit ouverte ou fermée*, and the scenes are sometimes as whimsical in their geography as the fancies which the writer expresses, but they are all tragic comedies of love. Such is almost the only way to classify them, because by quaint unreality and the amalgam of influences from the Elizabethan dramatists of England to the eighteenth-

century sentimentalists of France and the irony of the same period, they defy classification by types.

The authors treated in this chapter are far from exhausting the list of writers of comedy: Balzac, in his *Mercadet*, and George Sand, in her *François le Champi* and *le Marquis de Villemer*, tried to do in the drama what they were doing in the novel; Jules Sandeau won fame with *Mademoiselle de la Seiglière*, and with *le Gendre de Monsieur Poirier* in collaboration with Emile Augier; Ponsard had, in *l'Honneur et l'argent*, one of the last triumphs of the "école du bon sens," and gave one of the last important examples of the "swallow-tail" comedy in verse.

CHAPTER X

FICTION

THE novel, during the Restoration and the Monarchy of July shows varying tendencies. The historical romance, after a brief career of brilliancy, degenerates and takes refuge in the *feuilleton*. The romance of personal emotion, sometimes autobiographical, which was the traditional form, still shows some examples, or merges into the lyrical romances such as those of George Sand. That writer contributes to the development of the sociological, sometimes socialistic, novel, which again, in the hands of less gifted writers like Sue, betakes itself to the same *roman-feuilleton* style. On the other hand, the growth of Realism is seen in the psychological Stendhal, and in Mérimée and Balzac.

The Romantic school practically created the historical novel. Here again an important contribution came from abroad, especially from Sir Walter Scott. The American James Fenimore Cooper, who himself had much of Scott, both by his marine stories and his Indian tales influenced French authors from Balzac (*les Chouans*) to Sue, and, later, Gustave Aimard. But the prodigious development of historical fiction between 1820 and 1830 was the result of Scott. He not only made the Middle Ages less remote than in the epic treatment of Chateaubriand, but, by bringing in imagination, gave greater concreteness to the portrayal of the past. By picturesque description, use of local coloring, avoidance of generalised paraphrase, introduction of direct conversation, Scott made imaginary or remote characters vivid and real.

Consequently the anti-Classical revolutionaries drew abundantly from Scott. Nodier, who had visited Scotland, published in 1822 his *Trilby*, a short story, which was perhaps the first direct imitation in France of Scott. The first important work was Alfred de Vigny's *Cinq-Mars* (1826), though the vicomte d'Arlincourt had already written some historical novels according to the traditions of the Radcliffe story of mystery.

Alfred de Vigny attempted to reconstruct the spirit of the past. In preparation for his work he read two or three hundred volumes dealing with the first part of the seventeenth century. Then taking as hero the ambitious young *Cinq-Mars*, who attempted to supplant Richelieu, he surrounded a story of his life and of his love for Marie de Gonzague with a picture of the society of the times, introducing among the characters every historical personage he could think of. The result was a mosaic of incidents and of descriptions, in which Vigny flattered himself that he was making the old times live anew, but in which he made historical accuracy yield to the needs of the plot. But Vigny was not gifted with the power of creating such characters and tended to make them symbols for ideas, distinguishing between the truth of art and the truth of facts. The result was, consequently, cold and monotonous, and *Cinq-Mars* lacks the dash which enabled Hugo or Dumas to carry through works really no more meritorious.

Mérimée, in his *Chronique du règne de Charles IX*, went to work in a different manner. No less realistic in his treatment of local coloring than Vigny but lacking the pedantry of superabundant erudition, he carries the reader's interest more easily; moreover, the imaginary characters are more pliable to the reader's fancy. Mérimée's *Chronique* is the source of the operas *les Huguenots* and *le Pré aux clercs*.

In Hugo's *Notre-Dame de Paris* we find the author's characteristic virtues and vices. The novel is supposed to express the spirit of the civilisation of the late Middle Ages, as embodied in the great cathedral, centre of its life and spirit. Its story is

the development of the idea of fate illustrated in the word ΑΝΑΓΚΗ carved in one of its towers. Thus there is the usual substructure of anthropomorphism and symbolism. The characters are embodiments of the Hugoesque antithesis: Esmeralda, the gypsy foundling, brought up among vice and corruption, is purity; Quasimodo, the grotesque hunchback, is the true knight; Frollo, the priest and man of God, has the sinful heart, and Phœbus, the handsome captain, has in his soul the vice that Quasimodo wears on his face. The story is carried through a vast turmoil of incident and of language, until the reader, like the author, loses a sense of proportion. The book produces a wonderful impression, and mediæval Paris seems to rise before the eye, though it is only Hugo's Paris that we see. *Notre-Dame de Paris* is one of the greatest novels of the Romantic school.

Alexandre Dumas acknowledged himself a populariser. He was a wholesale purveyor of romances, sometimes scarcely more than planning what his collaborators wrote. Auguste Maquet was the chief assistant in what was dubbed the firm of "Alexandre Dumas & Co.," among whom were Paul Meurice, Lockroy, Leuven, Anicet-Bourgeois. Sometimes a story by Dumas was only a paraphrase or rewriting of a previous work of history or fiction, and the famous *Trois mousquetaires*, drawn from Courtilz de Sandras, practically comes under this heading. But though he had not the historical method of Vigny, he had the historical imagination, and so his novels often have what the models lack. They sin from the defects of the author: they are melodramatic, the style is technically bad, and diluted by spaced-out sentences and brief lines because Dumas was paid for his *feuilletons* by their length.[1] But readers will never be lacking for the *Trois*

[1] Dumas was not the only writer of fiction who contributed to the dilution of style during the heyday of the *feuilleton*: "Un de mes amis, dit Proudhon, reprochait un jour à Nodier les longs adverbes qui émaillent sa prose diffuse et lâche; il répondit qu'un mot de huit syllabes faisait une ligne et qu'une ligne valait un franc." — Quoted by A. Cassagne, *la Théorie de l'art pour l'art.*

mousquetaires and its sequels *Vingt ans après* and *le Vicomte de Bragelonne*, or the sixteenth-century tales *les Quarante-cinq*, *la Dame de Monsoreau*, *la Reine Margot*, or the tales connected with Cagliostro and the queen's necklace. In the *Comte de Monte-Cristo*, Dumas draws still more on his imagination and creates a hero based on the Byronic tradition of the mysterious being and on the apotheosis of himself.

Unfortunately, grotesqueness and exaggeration were sharp-edged tools for less gifted writers, and the Romantic novels were swamped by second-rate imitations by authors like Paul Lacroix (le Bibliophile Jacob), Roger de Beauvoir and Frédéric Soulié. By the development of the "atrocious" side in the shape of vice and horror, they debased the novel from literature to the story of crime, and threw open the door to the cheap *feuilleton* style corresponding to our dime-novel literature.

Henri Beyle (1783–1842), who sought to appear more distinguished under the pseudonym of Stendhal, was an author of strong individuality but of little vogue in his own time, who has since been resurrected. "I shall be read," he said, "about 1880," and the prophecy came true. His temperament, intellectual and physical, was that of a thorough-going materialist: he was a pupil of the Ideologists, and thought as a successor of Helvétius and d'Holbach would think. The spiritual was meaningless to him: "God's single excuse," he declared, "is that he does not exist." The only thing in life for him was the satisfaction of the senses: not the degenerate pleasures of modern deliquescents, but a fine brutal indulgence. He scorned what he considered the smug inertia of the French of his day, bowing hypocritically to virtue and making love wait on the notary and the marriage contract. He contrasted it with the fierce and unrestrained passions of his beloved Italians, and called the latter's temperament energy or courage. But this "courage" took the form of sensuality, for Beyle saw in love the sum total of all enjoyment: "L'amour a toujours été pour moi la plus grande des affaires, ou plutôt la seule." So Beyle, who was an

eternal *poseur*, posed in his writings as the exponent of what has been called "Beylism," a brutal cult of self overriding all obstacles, moral or otherwise, for the sake of pleasure. Conventionality he loathed, heaped ridicule on the prudery or *bégueulisme* of his times, and the cult of "good form": "Dans la vie commune, le bégueulisme est l'art de s'offenser pour le compte des vertus qu'on n'a pas; en littérature, c'est l'air de jouir avec des goûts qu'on ne sent point. . . . On dit que la pruderie est la vertu des femmes qui n'en ont pas; le bégueulisme littéraire ne serait-il point le bon goût de ces gens que la nature avait faits tout simplement pour être sensibles à l'argent, ou pour aimer avec passion les dindes truffées?" Stendhal succeeded so well in carrying out his views that when Alfred de Musset and George Sand met him on their way to Venice, his coarseness was too much for them.

Stendhal's two most important novels, *le Rouge et le noir* and *la Chartreuse de Parme*, illustrate his theories, in so far as his heroes are anti-heroes. The Julien Sorel of *le Rouge et le noir* is a heartless fortune-seeker, taking to clerical "black" instead of the military "red," because under the Restoration the clergy had replaced the Napoleonic military as source of power,[1] and seducing two women who have loved him. A true specimen of Beylism, he is at war with society like a Romantic hero, but rather because he is bad, and not society, as with the Romanticists. Or rather, he thinks it bad because it inculcates restraint and deceit. In the *Chartreuse de Parme*, the hero Fabrice is an Italian Julien Sorel, who, after a period of youthful enthusiasm, betakes himself to a life of intrigue and of ecclesiastical hypocrisy.

Stendhal belongs to no school of his time. He has certain Romantic traits because of his abnormal and eccentric characters, because of the stress he lays on love, especially the *amour-passion* (as in his book *l'Amour*), and because in his *Racine et Shakespeare* his hatred for the stilted conventionality of the

[1] Bayle had the obsession, the "hantise" of Napoleon.

seventeenth century, with its formal rules of literature and society, caused him to heap ridicule upon it to the consequent benefit of modern literature. On the other hand, as no Romanticist does, he analyses character. He proceeds by the infinitely small, and sees details rather than whole bodies, but his method is a psychological one, a study of facts, or of the facts of sensation. In that sense he is a Realist, and his description of the battle of Waterloo in the *Chartreuse de Parme* is traditionally opposed to Victor Hugo's account in *les Misérables*, the former following the individual participant in a mighty contest of which, as a mere unit, he knows not the meaning, the latter dealing with big masses only. In his study of minute detail to the neglect of the general plot, Stendhal compares himself to the painter studying an *écorché* or skinless figure of the artists' studios. This tendency to analyse and express sensations comes out in his works on Italy, which he knew so well, such as *Rome, Naples et Florence* and *Promenades dans Rome*. They are accompaniments to a study of Italy by the most acute of observers, by one whose erudition may be at fault, but who has an unerring appreciation for human associations in the past.

It takes a peculiar cast of mind to care for Stendhal. His novels are tedious and prolix, his style is dull and colorless. Yet upon Realists like Balzac or later writers of the psychological school like Paul Bourget, the influence of Stendhal has been considerable, and even a constructive critic and philosopher like Taine owes something to him, in the cult for the "petit fait significatif."

Prosper Mérimée (1803–1870) is sometimes called a transition between Romanticism and Realism. He wrote some things which may come under the heading of Romantic literature, but in temperament he was as different as any one could be. A polished man of the world, with a slight affectation of Anglo-Saxon placidity, he had nothing in common with the hysterics of the Jeunes-France. A functionary of the ministry of Fine Arts and inspector of historical monuments, as well as a senator

under the Empire and a lifelong friend of the empress Eugénie, whom he had known when she was only a Spanish countess, he had his *entrées* to learned and social gatherings. Reserved in disposition and pose, and feigning a detachment from all things but his cats and his bric-à-brac, he left a voluminous correspondence, parts of which have been published, revealing his inner life more than that of most persons. Thus it appears that the imperturbable gentleman had a dirty mind and a susceptible heart.

Mérimée's connection with Romanticism was scarcely more than a pastime. In a day when literary impersonations after the earlier example of Ossian were popular, he manufactured the *Théâtre de Clara Gazul*, the dramatic production of a supposed Spanish actress and writer. The trick was successful and the writings won great applause. Then, with increasing audacity, Mérimée transposed "Gazul" into "Guzla" and published a false collection of Illyrian songs, which once more imposed on the public. But as local coloring seemed so easy to manufacture, Mérimée evidently thought he had enough of it. Except for the *Chronique du règne de Charles IX*, his other imaginative writings are in a style of impeccable reserve. Even in *Colomba* and *Carmen*, stories of Corsican vendetta and of Spanish jealousy, the picturesqueness is subordinated to the observation and calm registration of fact. For Mérimée was one of the first writers to be influenced by Stendhal and to approach the objectivity of the Realists.

The most striking note of Mérimée's style is his irony, not a frisky irreverence, but a calm scepticism and disbelief in enthusiasms and sentiment, a scorn for mankind, which presented French writers with a new "attitude."

Apart from his fiction, in the list of which one may also mention the stories *Tamango*, *Mateo Falcone*, *l'Enlèvement de la redoute*, *le Vase étrusque* and *la Vénus d'Ille*, Mérimée wrote various works on art and history and did much to make Russian literature known in France. Of his letters, published after his

death, the most famous portion are the *Lettres à une inconnue*, now known to have been a Mlle Jenny Dacquin of Boulogne-sur-Mer, with whom he kept up for a long time a correspondence, sometimes philandering, but none the less of great value as a human document and for the moral and intellectual history of Mérimée's epoch. The *Lettres à une autre inconnue* (Mme Przedzięcka) are less significant.

Aurore Dupin, baronne Dudevant, always known now by her pseudonym of George Sand (1804–1876), was on her father's side descended from Maurice de Saxe. Her mother was a fast woman of common birth, so that she was a cross between high and low strains of blood, and suffered from her bringing up amid the wrangling of a vain and vulgar mother and a proud and domineering grandmother. The result was that she followed her own course, roaming the countryside of her native Berry, often so immersed in her fancies that people thought her a fool, or undergoing crises of religious mysticism at the Couvent des Anglaises in Paris, where she went to school. At sixteen she was married to the baron Dudevant, a well-meaning but coarse and narrow-minded country squire addicted to drink and ancillary loves. For a long time the wife chafed under the yoke, which she finally threw over and went to Paris to live a free life with her husband's consent. It was not until much later that she sought an annulment of her marriage. She spent her time as a literary bohemian, often disguised as a man, and soon won a reputation by her books. She first lived with Jules Sandeau, and wrote in collaboration with him her first novel, *Rose et Blanche*. From him she took her literary name, George Sand. In 1833 came her trip to Italy with Alfred de Musset, which she afterwards wrote up in *Elle et lui*, and her infatuation for Pagello. She had various other affairs, usually with men younger than herself, which often influenced her work. Chief among these was one with the musician Chopin (see *Lucrezia Floriani*). She was also the disciple of Michel (de Bourges), who pleaded for her at the annulment of her marriage, of Lamennais and

Pierre Leroux, as well as the friend of Liszt and Sainte-Beuve, the adviser of Dumas the younger and Flaubert. Mérimée she hated, and she could not sympathise with Balzac. After 1839 her time was spent in her native country place, at Nohant, in Berry, where the stormy petrel became a *bourgeoise*, less sedate perhaps than has been her reputation, but occupied, when not writing, with her housekeeping and the amusements of her grandchildren.

The stock division of George Sand's literary productivity is into four periods: firstly, the novels attacking society, particularly the institution of marriage, and setting forth the claims of the *femme incomprise*; secondly, those written under the influence of philosophical and sociological utopians; thirdly, the lyrical and pastoral romances; fourthly, the slightly idealised novel of manners.

George Sand was the embodiment of the spirit of Rousseau. To an intensely sensitive and emotional nature and the feeling of her own unhappy marriage, she added, like the poets, Byronic revolt and the moral malady of the age of René and Obermann, and turned against the ordinances of man. In the incoherent reading of her youth she had dabbled in a vast amount of literature from the great poets to the eighteenth-century innovators. The result was a seething mass of unsystematic ideas. So though she rarely undertakes, of malice prepense, to formulate a theory, her stories are susceptible of resolution into argument. In *Indiana* and *Valentine*, which seemed to the readers of the thirties the climax of immorality, George Sand asserts the rights of love, free and unrestrained. Passion is irresistible, and the woman who is unhappy and generally misunderstood in marriage is justified in breaking the ties of slavery which keep an ego from its affinity. Thus George Sand was following Rousseau in attacking society. It was in the same spirit that she proclaimed the emancipation of woman, and that, in her lyrical, flowery and hyperbolical prose, she, as her critics said, idealised adultery. In *Lélia*, which followed and definitely won fame for

George Sand, and the plot of which seemed partly to anticipate the experience with Alfred de Musset, she introduces in full force the Romantic despair of living and the delight and grandeur of suffering. Between the vampire of love Lélia and the courtesan Pulchérie pass the figures of the poet Sténio doomed to suicide, and of Trenmor the regenerate convict, like Jean Valjean later. *Jacques* is the drama of tragic renunciation, in which the magnanimous husband kills himself that his wife and her lover may be happy. *Mauprat* is less specifically a *roman à thèse* and is correspondingly superior. It portrays the taming of a wild and savage hero by the woman he comes to love.

George Sand's second literary period began about 1840. She fell under the influence of the regenerators of society, and her stories either portray her friends or give concrete form to their theories. She did not linger much over the parodies of religion of the Père Enfantin and the Saint-Simonists, but she became infatuated with the democracy of Lamennais, until they gradually fell apart over theories concerning the equality of woman with man (*Lettres à Marcie*); she was swayed by the volubility of Michel (de Bourges), the sallow and bespectacled demagogue and his plans of social reconstitution drawn from Babeuf and Rousseau; she wrote in support of Agricol Perdiguier[1] the *Compagnon du tour de France*, with its loves of proletarian heroes and ladies of high rank, and its glorification of plebeian virtues, much to the distress of the *bourgeois*. But the most important of these influences came from Pierre Leroux, whose obscure pantheistic humanitarianism she undertook to interpret. *Spiridion* is a mixture of the ideas of Lamennais and Leroux, and develops a deistic religion to replace Christianity. The shapes of an eternal Becoming and death are but transformations of

[1] Agricol Perdiguier (Avignonnais-la-Vertu) was a journeyman carpenter who wrote the *Livre du compagnonnage* for the defence and improvement of the old *Compagnonnages* or journeyman's trades-unions, whose ramifications spread over France like freemasonry and foreshadowed the modern syndicates. It was the socialistic side which appealed to George Sand.

substance and a migration. In the *Sept cordes de la lyre*, a sort of philosophical drama copied from *Faust*, George Sand symbolises by the harmony of the strings of the lyre the harmony to which humanity should be tuned.

Meanwhile, through Liszt and particularly Chopin, the influence of the musicians began to mingle with the visionary pseudo-philosophy. *Consuelo* is the story of a beautiful Venetian singer driven from home to avoid the persecution of an unwelcome lover and sent to the mysterious castle of Rudolstadt in Bohemia. There she becomes the deathbed bride of the count, who, like a good disciple of Leroux and of his theories of the transmigration of souls, passes away after telling her that he is to return to the world in a new birth. He will then be calm, strong and delivered from the memory of his past existences by which he has been tortured and punished for many centuries. In the sequel, the *Comtesse de Rudolstadt*, the socialism of Leroux and Michel (de Bourges) again gets the upper-hand. The book is a hodge-podge of disquisitions on occult sciences and freemasonry, which was to George Sand the symbol of a mystical brotherhood for the regeneration of humanity. The count comes to life, having been in but a lethargy or catalepsy, and with her husband Consuelo goes through the world preaching the happiness of mankind.

Socialism, in a less mystical and more concrete form, reappears in the next two important works. In the *Meunier d'Angibault*, an attack on the inequalities of birth and fortune, the penniless hero refuses to marry the rich woman who loves him until she has got rid of her fortune, that they may follow together the new religion of brotherhood. In the *Péché de Monsieur Antoine* she pleads Fourieristic communism.

George Sand welcomed the Revolution of 1848. She edited the *Bulletins de la République* under the auspices of Ledru-Rollin, she admired Louis Blanc and the agitator Barbès. But with the *coup d'état* and the downfall of her hopes, though she had occasional revivals of enthusiasm for the mysticism of Bal-

lanche or of Jean Reynaud,[1] she devoted herself chiefly to the composition of pastoral romances, among which her masterpieces are to be found. Already in 1846 she had published *la Mare au diable*, and this was followed by *la Petite Fadette* and *François le Champi*. In these graceful works George Sand does not try to reform the universe, but depicts scenes of her native province in their sylvan beauty, and peoples them with the slightly idealised figures of the rustics with whose life she was so well acquainted. In the characters of Germain the "fin laboureur" and little Marie of *la Mare au diable*, or the *bessons* (twins) Landry and Sylvinet with the sprite-like Fanchon Fadet, George Sand has enriched the literature of rural France with its most poetical pages. These outweigh all the declamations of the previous novels. But the disciple of Rousseau is still to be seen in them.

Finally, in the years after 1860, George Sand turned to novels of a less individual character. Such are *Jean de la Roche* and *le Marquis de Villemer*. *Les Beaux messieurs de Bois-Doré* brings back the spirit of d'Urfé's *Astrée*.

This is a very incomplete list of George Sand's chief works. One of her most useful bequests to posterity was her highly valuable correspondence. She produced over a hundred volumes with incredible facility of improvisation. A friend called her a "robinet," or faucet, to be turned on at will. She reflected almost passively the intellectual influence of the numerous men of genius with whom she came in contact, although morally she sometimes sucked their strength away. Her lyrical, though clear and limpid, style was an expression of the Romantic spirit. Yet her idealism has a strong stamp of the sensualism of her youth, at times soaring to God in a mystic adoration of earthly love which seems a parody of Marguerite de Navarre, at times

[1] Jean Reynaud was originally a Saint-Simonist, but he cut adrift from the materialism of Enfantin; author of *Terre et ciel*. He believed that, in after life, beings pass from planet to planet without losing personality, and acquire a progressive perfectibility like that of science.

expressing itself in the amorous maternity of Rousseau's "maman," Mme de Warens. Her actual faith passed from Catholicism to the hatred of revealed religion, at any rate the Catholic one, and a belief in a vague deistic religiosity, which could harmonise with most creeds, including those of the utopians. Though she is comparatively little read nowadays, her importance is considerable, both for the fame which she won in her own day, and for the putting into circulation of theories about woman and the relation of the sexes. These popularised the treatment of such topics in the problem plays of the next literary generation.

Honoré de Balzac (1799–1850), like some other writers with imposing names, was of humble origin and came from a family in southern France originally named Balssa. His burning ambition from youth was to be a famous writer, and his whole life was given up to Herculean labor, partly to win glory, partly to pay off huge debts which his bad business management and extravagance brought upon him. Overwork finally killed him. He had been educated for a solicitor's career and afterwards established business concerns as printer in which he sank a great deal of money, but where he got some of the experience of life and of financial methods described in his novels.

Balzac's first writings were utterly unoriginal and are correspondingly forgotten today. He could only begin by elaborate and fantastic plots in the style of the popular writers of his youth, from Pigault-Lebrun and Ducray-Duminil to the primitive English models of the School of Terror such as Maturin. As he progressed he took as examples Scott or Cooper, and, in fact, Balzac, though the leader of the Realists, never entirely fell away from certain Romantic tendencies, and was always ready to dabble in the mysterious and supernatural, whether Swedenborgianism or plain Mesmerism. He had an imagination which worked on a huge scale, and the hallucinations of his creative genius, stimulated by the black coffee on which he kept himself

alive, had a parallel in the distorting mirrors through which he saw the world of his workaday life.

With growing fame and constant improvement, Balzac conceived, about 1834, the idea of a portraiture of the society of his times, by a vast creation of characters appearing in his different books and connecting them. As La Fontaine had seen in his fables representing life an "ample comédie à cent actes divers," and as Dante had written the "Divine Comedy," so Balzac wished to construct a *Comédie humaine*. He united as far as possible the books already written, and so systematically worked out the careers of his new creations that it has been possible to publish a biographical dictionary of Balzac's men and women, in which their lives, drawn from different novels, appear before us with full consistency. A number of the books which were to fit into the scheme Balzac never lived to write.

Balzac did not confine himself to one scene or to one class of society, or even to one part of France, but subdivided the *Comédie humaine* into scenes from private life, scenes from provincial life, scenes from political life, scenes from military life and scenes from country life. Others among his works, which do not enter well into this classification, purport to be "philosophical studies" or "analytical studies." The total production of Balzac is an enormous one for an author who died comparatively young, even omitting the numerous productions of his younger years, historical novels like *les Chouans*, philosophical tales like *la Peau de chagrin*, Rabelaisian tales, such as the *Contes drolatiques*, or the self-describing *Physiologie du mariage*. Yet Balzac's composition was a difficult one, and he achieved his results only by constant erasures and modifications of his proof-sheets. The result shows itself in a labored and sometimes unreadably tedious style. None the less, by his portrayal of character, Balzac must be rated among the great novelists of the nineteenth century, and his language, in spite of its dislocated nature, is a powerful expression for his thought.

Balzac's chief topic is the world of intrigue, especially business

intrigue, and he excels at showing the perversity of villains who destroy position, character and happiness. In the *Curé de Tours* we see a harmless priest a prey to jealousy and spite, in *Ursule Mirouet* co-heirs scheming for a fortune. Like Thackeray, Balzac is weak in portraying virtue or innocence, and a quality is apt to be in him exaggerated into a defect. Like Dickens, his characters stand forth as types. Old man Goriot's love for his unworthy daughters in *le Père Goriot* is the parody of Lear, and the Mme de Mortsauf of *le Lys dans la vallée* makes one weary of virtue. Balzac excels on the other hand in the portrayal of vice, and though here again we get exaggeration or, at any rate, exceptions from the normal, the effect remains impressive, and we have enduring characters in misers like old Grandet or Gobseck, in the spiteful old maid Mlle Gamard of the *Curé de Tours*, in the jealous Cousine Bette, in the moral degenerate Hulot or the society sponge le Cousin Pons. The convict Vautrin, even though partly modelled on the ex-criminal Vidocq, carries Realism to the extent of Romantic exaggeration, and makes us think of some of Hugo's symbolic figures, like Jean Valjean, hovering over society.

Balzac is most at home describing financial operations, as in *Eugénie Grandet*, or *César Birotteau* (his *Silas Lapham*). This enables him to use his documentary method, the detailed reproduction of procedure. The same method applied to concrete objects accounts for much of the tediousness of Balzac: a narrative is apt to be almost all description or enumeration, to the complete neglect of the plot.

Thus we see in what way Balzac stands at the dividing line between Romanticism and Realism. His early reading and the potency of his imagination inclined him to the fantastic and supernatural, and to the exaggeration or distortion of normal types. But his desire to reproduce the concrete fact and to visualise the scene or object in print, makes him the best painter of French manners of the Restoration and the reign of Louis-Philippe among the *bourgeoisie* of town and country. For that

reason, in spite of many wearisome pages, such as the almost unreadable and yet convincing detective story, *Une ténébreuse affaire*, Balzac must always remain one of the most necessary authors of French literature. He was a leader for the whole succeeding generation of documentary or Realistic novelists.

The broadening of the patronage of fiction brought about the *feuilleton*, the serial story of the periodical press. This has been hinted at above in connection with the historical novel. Stendhal spoke of fiction as divisible into "romans de salon" and "romans de femme de chambre," and the latter kind found an outlet in papers like the *Presse* of Emile de Girardin. In that journal was published in 1842 the *Mystères de Paris* of Eugène Sue (1804–1857), with its scenes of low life and of vice, and its thesis that modern civilisation crushes the toiling classes and drives the innocent into corruption and immorality. The book expresses the spirit of Fourierism. *Le Juif errant* attacks the Jesuits and their intrigues, in the person of the treacherous hypocrite Rodin.

Eugène Sue was the writer who most closely approached literary art, but he had minor compeers in Frédéric Soulié, with his *Mémoires du Diable*, full of filth and crime; in Ponson du Terrail, whose dark villain Rocambole is a degenerate descendant of Byron through Dumas, and whose style is illustrated by the phrase attributed to him, "His hands were cold and clammy, like those of a snake;" in Paul Féval, whose customary coarseness has made people forget that he could write imaginative works like *la Fée des grèves*. In Paul de Kock, who might well deserve the onomatopoetic adjective "cocasse" and whose popularity equalled that of Hugo, France had a writer with a wild exuberance of humor which made his *risqué* stories innocuous. He was the voluble mouthpiece in his generation of the *esprit gaulois*.

The tradition of the *feuilleton* has continued to our day, and Sue and Soulié have had successors in the favor of the *concierges* in writers like Xavier de Montépin, Emile Richebourg or Alexis

Bouvier. Emile Gaboriau and Fortuné du Boisgobey gave new renown to the detective novel which the French got originally from Edgar Allan Poe, and the M. Lecoq of Gaboriau had his fame long before Sherlock Holmes.

The sociological novel is not separable from the *feuilleton*. Apart from George Sand's books, Sue's stories have sociological tendencies in corroboration of the utopians. They distinctly helped to bring on the Revolution of 1848, and Sue's *Sept péchés capitaux*, like the *Mystères de Paris*, is influenced by the paradoxes of Fourierism, and argues the goodness of the deadly sins. This style of novel reaches its climax in *les Misérables* of Hugo, in which the author reeks with humanitarianism, and with his usual love of antithesis shows transformation scenes of character by which villains are transformed into angels, and in which the sinner and prostitute are so glorified, as the victims of an unjust world, that we begin to think them more full of good qualities than the righteous.

Among writers of second rank the name of Gérard de Nerval (1808–1855) has already appeared in our account of the heroic days of Romanticism to which he belonged through his whole career of genius or insanity, ending in a mysterious death, murder or suicide. Maurice de Guérin (1810–1839), poet in prose and verse, interpreter of the moods of nature and of religious feeling, is, like his sister Eugénie, more read about than read. Alphonse Karr (1808–1890) was the Aristophanes or Merry-andrew of literary journalism, and Emile Souvestre (1806–1854), like Brizeux, was a writer about Brittany.

CHAPTER XI

HISTORIANS, CRITICS, AND PUBLICISTS

ONE of the chief benefits of Romanticism to the student of literature was to make historical writing interesting and a part of literature itself, as it never had been before and has not been since. In earlier generations histories had tended, with exceptions like those of Voltaire or the Benedictines, to be dull chronicles, or paraphrases conventionally recorded, or imitations of Livy or De Thou, or *a priori* generalisations. Thierry sets forth the defects of the older rhetorical historians in his *Lettre sur l'histoire de France* and the *Dix ans d'études historiques*. At the present moment history has become nearly divorced from literature, and the historians construct works almost as technical as a catalogue, a bibliography, or a treatise on physics. It was the prerogative of the Romantic age to produce works which were, with varying degrees of accuracy, almost always readable. It is true that they were partly the result of something as scientifically reprehensible as the historical novel. In other instances they were vitiated by theories of metaphysics and by cosmologies imported from Germany, which country in the nineteenth century has exercised much influence on certain French thinkers. By many French people, after Mme de Staël's time, that land was looked upon as the home of pacific and simple-mannered but erudite folk devoted to cornflowers and mental culture, steeped in meditative and idealistic sentiment. This conception of their neighbors' spiritual and intellectual temper was what the French termed "Germanism," and an important borrowing by some great writers was a vague pantheistic interpretation of historical evo-

lution. At any rate, for writers as varied as Cousin, Quinet, Michelet, Taine, and Renan, Germany was the great source of inspiration. It took the war of 1870 to shatter the delusion that the Germans were unpractical poets and scholars.[1]

The leader in historical writing in modern France was Augustin Thierry (1795–1856), the blind and paralysed author, whose achievements in the face of obstacles make him one of the heroes of literature. Thierry gave life to history, and his great inspirers were Sir Walter Scott and Chateaubriand, to whom he was indebted for the stirring of his historical imagination. He himself relates how in his school-days the account of the Franks in the *Martyrs* so aroused him that he marched up and down repeating, "Pharamond! Pharamond! nous avons combattu avec l'épée!"

Augustin Thierry (his brother Amédée was a reputable historian also) had the faculty of evoking from the texts as he read them, or as they were read to him, the life and manners of the period. He was not free from bias and preconceived ideas, and his early intimacy with the socialist Saint-Simon had awakened in his mind notions of liberalism and sympathy for the people, which underly his study of the freeing of the *communes* and the rise to power of the Third Estate (*Essai sur la formation et le progrès du Tiers-Etat*). He saw the Revolution of 1848 in his own day, with the advent of the proletariat, give the lie to his theories on the civil progress of the *bourgeoisie*.

Thierry's chief work is the *Histoire de la conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands*, in which, instead of following the victors to the conquered land, he places himself, to express his theory of the "antagonism of two races," rather at the standpoint of the gradually submerged people. His other important work is the *Récits des temps mérovingiens*, the reanimation of the old

[1] A pontiff in France of Germany and a believer in the superiority of the Germanic *race* was the comte de Gobineau (1816–1882). He had some effect on Renan, but was not much known in his own land as a writer until recently.

sixth-century chronicles of Gregory of Tours, so that the archaic narratives spring into the vividness of a romance by Scott.

Thierry was the chief of what has been called the "picturesque school," sometimes the "impressionistic school," of those who tried to make the past live again. No one was more anxious than Thierry to be accurate and to replace the rhetoric of the seventeenth and eighteenth-century historians by the method of documentary proof. Two things detract from his value to modern scientific historians: firstly, his imagination led him, at any rate in the works written after his blindness, to warp by his reconstruction the probable truth in his mental vision of the past; secondly, his almost feminine sensibility led him to side with the losing cause and to view its downfall as an epic, or to read into history his own sociological prepossessions shaped by a poet's touch.

If Thierry represents the sane use of the imagination in history, Quinet and Michelet embody rampant Romanticism, the former as a philosopher of history, the latter as a narrator.

Edgar Quinet (1803–1875) was the great exponent of German ideas in France, where, like Pierre Leroux and Michelet, he interpreted history under the form of a vague symbolic pantheism. Quinet was a man of poetic and mystical temperament who had fed on Chateaubriand, of quick feeling, and of great power in rapid though hazardous philosophical intuition or synthesis. He travelled in Germany and fell under the spell of Herder and of his interpretation of the philosophy of history, the process of studying the world-development as an organic whole. This was precisely a pantheistic conception, a metaphysical and poetical theory of historical evolution, in which the eye ranged over the vastness of humanity, casting upon it a network of law. That law enunciated the immanence of the divine will throughout the universe, where all the forms of being are a manifestation of God. In temperaments like those of Quinet, Michelet, or Leroux, such methods of interpretation meant the substitution of the imagination for the reason and

the confusion of symbol with fact.[1] In Quinet the pantheistic law was, instead of divine immanence, rather one of free moral and social progress, which he preached with apostolic fervor. Thus the "perfectibility" of the Revolutionaries and of the Ideologists spiritualised was undergoing intimations of a dynamic immortality, in an evolution similar to that which the spirit of the times made Darwin apply from without to the selection of species. History became the mirror of the universal soul of mankind, free to act, though linked by countless relations to the rest of the world, and gradually evolving the reign of liberty and justice under the guidance of the supreme will.

Quinet's first writings, then, reflect Herder and the German influence. The *Essai sur Herder* (1827) was followed not long after by *Ahasvérus*, a symbolic prose poem of the Wandering Jew and of humanity in search of the ideal, *Napoléon*, an epic belonging to the period of Napoleonolatry of the Monarchy of July, and *Prométhée*, also in verse, proclaiming the victory of freedom over determinism.

A spiritualist and theist, but with anti-Catholic inclinations, Quinet plunged into political discussion, and on becoming professor at the Collège de France he broke out, conjointly with Michelet, into virulent attacks, in his lectures, against the Jesuits, which caused turmoil and riots. Later, after the Romantic movement had passed away, Quinet, in his numerous historical and critical writings, underwent the influence of the new scientific movement, which he always interpreted through the refraction of his poetic temperament, in books like *la Création* (1870). His liberal aspirations in political reform concerning

[1] "L'esprit panthéistique pouvait se définir: usurpation par l'imagination et le sentiment du rôle de la raison, défaut d'embarras en présence des questions suprêmes, il suffisait qu'on tranchât par intuition, inspiration ou passion, les problèmes les plus étendus que proposent la nature et l'histoire, pour tomber dans des idées bien apparentées aux idées germaniques, sans besoin d'avoir médité pour cela les Fichte ou les Schelling." — Lasserre, *le Romantisme français*.

the democratic state and its relations with education and the Church have been partly realised, in a less generous spirit, by the France of today. But Quinet himself, because of political animosities and the incoherence of his powerful intellect, reflecting itself in his style (he has been compared to Carlyle), has been rather neglected by historians of French literature.

The name of Quinet is scarcely separable from that of Jules Michelet (1798–1874), another historian with a poetic imagination and the most popular writer of the "picturesque school." Michelet's poverty-stricken experience in youth was pathetic, but, though it weakened his constitution, it did not stunt the enthusiasm of his historical studies or the fierceness of his attacks against those whom he deemed the foes of liberty. He had made his trip to Germany before Quinet his, and had learned to admire Herder and Hegel. But the author who particularly gave him his start in philosophical thought was the eighteenth-century Neapolitan writer Vico, a broad generaliser before Herder upon history and its epic manifestations, one who viewed men as emblems, and facts as symbols in the world-progress, and one who conceived history as a series of three successive stages marked by characteristics constantly renewed in rotation. Michelet, who translated Vico's book under the title *Principes de la philosophie de l'histoire*, looked upon history as an epic (his favorite poet was Virgil) or a drama, and as a resurrection in which even inanimate objects and places are inspired with symbolic existence and men are manifestations of the spirit of the age: Jeanne d'Arc personifies patriotism and embodies the masses. This pantheistic attitude did not hinder him, at any rate in his later writings, from accounting for the greatest changes in actual history by the minutest causes, such as a king's fistula.

Michelet's first original books were a *Précis de l'histoire moderne* and an *Histoire romaine*, but his great work was the *Histoire de France*. He began with a series of volumes on the Middle Ages

in which he conscientiously studied the old documents; but far from leaving them to speak for themselves alone, he recreated the men and manners of the past and stamped upon all his potent imagination, so that it became history in the shape of romance. The Middle Ages were the favorite hunting ground of the Romanticists, as we have seen, and they aroused Michelet's imagination, until his glowing style made the old times speak again in the narrative of action, and in the description of art and architecture, even of geography.

Michelet had treated the Catholic Church sympathetically, but he gradually passed to a new attitude toward it, partly as the result of the attacks of Louis Veuillot. Simultaneously with Quinet, he assailed the Jesuits vigorously in his public lectures at the Collège de France. He was becoming more and more a believer in the religion of humanity and the democratic mysticism which took hold of so many people at the approach of the mid-century. He now saw in the Middle Ages the wrongs and sufferings of the common people. Not only did he interrupt his story at the end of the Middle Ages to publish his works on the Jesuits, on *le Prêtre*, *la femme et la famille*, and *le Peuple*, but he passed over to modern France and wrote the *Histoire de la Révolution*, the victory of the people and the coming of Law and Justice. This he did among days, first of hope and then of discouragement, during the preparation and the failure of the democratic outburst of 1848.

When Michelet returned to the history of the intervening years, from the Renaissance to the end of the old régime, it was in a different spirit. His imagination had now run away with his scholarship, and his dithyrambic sympathy became iambic rage. In a style no longer poetical, but abrupt, involved, and jolting, he tore to pieces the lives of the kings and queens of France, looking for the basest interpretations of motives, yielding to literary exaggeration, preferring the melodramatic to the rational explanation, and dwelling with uncalled for emphasis on sexual and obstetrical details. In place of the imaginative-

ness of his mediæval visions the history of France was now largely explained by physical operations.

The mixture of poetry and physiology is found also in those books in which his wife collaborated to some degree, the rhapsodies partly written during retirement in the country on *l'Oiseau*, *l'Insecte*, *la Mer*, *la Montagne*. In these works Michelet's natural history is that of a "nature faker," and the pantheistic visions of the divine spirit permeating everything transport to the animal and mineral kingdoms the philosophy of emotional humanitarianism with which the times were instinct. Zoology and geology became poetry, and Buffon or the Saint-Lamberts and Delilles of decayed Classicism have their Romantic antithesis in this prose lyricism of nature. Of works like *l'Amour* [1] and *la Femme*, as well as the effort to continue the history of France during the enfeeblement of old age, nothing should be said.

Michelet, taken all in all, is the most entrancing French historian: far more than any other he makes the dead past seem living. His poetic prose is not simple reading for the foreigner, but it is intense and thrilling, though its stimulus represents the greatest dissolvent of Classical taste.

The reverse of the apocalyptic, mystical, and pantheistic view of history of Michelet is to be found in the rigid and dogmatic writings of the doctrinaire Guizot, who could more truly lay claim to representing a "philosophical" school. Michelet turned to the imaginative metaphysics of Germany, Guizot to the prosaic constitutional theories of England. But the cold pedagogue who loved principles and not anecdotes was not impeccable in his systematic conclusions, any more than the excitable Michelet or any more than his precursor Montesquieu. None the less his desire to determine the great reasons of events

[1] "La sensibilité et l'optimisme du XVIIIe siècle, dont Michelet fut le plus fidèle continuateur, y vaticinent avec une romantique frénésie. Les 'harmonies de la nature' y sont expliquées et célébrées en phrases sursautantes et fiévreuses. Cela fait songer à un Bernardin de Saint-Pierre un peu épileptique." — Jules Lemaître, *les Contemporains*, 7e série.

and to discover the guiding principles of history gave it higher dignity as a science than did the poetry of Michelet. His chief writings, often heavy and colorless in style, were the *Essais sur l'histoire de France*, the *Révolution d'Angleterre*, the *Histoire générale de la civilisation en Europe*, the *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de mon temps*, and the *Histoire de France racontée à mes petits-enfants*.

François Mignet (1796–1884) employs, on the whole, the same historical methods as Guizot. He wrote various studies of Spanish history, but his most important work was the *Histoire de la Révolution*, in which his rigid classifications and deductions gave to his work the appearance of a strongly fatalistic interpretation.

Adolphe Thiers is the exponent of the narrative school, and his *Histoire de la Révolution*, followed by the *Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire*, are to be contrasted, if for nothing else, for their detailed treatment with the concision of Mignet's philosophical exposition of the Revolution. Thiers felt that the historian should put himself in the background, and not seek to impose attention either by an eccentric style or by artificial grouping of facts. He wished to narrate events in order, as they happened, and be the perfect recorder or journalist. Consequently his style is easy, sometimes to the extent of looseness, but clear and business-like. As a historian, his work is of value in spite of his commonplace *bourgeois* ideals. Thiers's treatment of Napoleon and his victories was to a considerable degree responsible for the renewal of interest in the Napoleonic legend as a reaction against the flatness of the reign of Louis-Philippe.

Henri Martin (1810–1883) had most of Thiers's defects without his qualities. His *Histoire de France* has usually been considered a standard work, but it was, as first planned, too big an undertaking for the author, and in style it hardly rises above respectable mediocrity. It was originally written as a publisher's enterprise at rapid speed which precluded careful study, but the author spent much of his life afterward in correcting

and improving his work. Martin was a follower of Jean Reynaud, and he had imbibed his ideas of the unity of God and his fad concerning the influence of the druids on the French national character, but without the mysticism of the master.

Louis Blanc, the socialist and disciple of Rousseau, contributed to the downfall of Louis-Philippe by his rhetorical *Histoire de dix ans* and the first volumes of his *Histoire de la Révolution française*, which were in many ways party pamphlets rather than impartial history.

Alexis de Tocqueville (1805–1859) is of special interest to Americans because of his work on American democracy, which in turn became an important text-book to the participants in the European popular tendencies culminating in the mid-century movements. Tocqueville was of aristocratic lineage and on his mother's side was a descendant from Malesherbes, the eighteenth-century statesman. In 1831 he took, with a friend Gustave de Beaumont, a trip to America to make an investigation of the American penitentiaries for the government. A more serious result of the journey was the study of *la Démocratie en Amérique*, in preparation for which Tocqueville travelled all over the young republic observing every phase of its civilisation and customs. The work is neither history nor simply political philosophy, but deduces from the study of America results applicable to the author's own land. He could, he felt, investigate the effect of pure democracy in the United States in order to fit the results to a land where many counteracting forces come into play. Tocqueville is a fatalist and accepts as inevitable, even at that early day, the full advent of democracy, but he desires to warn it of its dangers and to teach it to ward off despotism. Some of his conclusions with regard to America have been vitiated by unlooked for causes, but they were based on keen insight of the times in which he wrote, and many could still be of profit to the present democracy of his own country. The concluding volumes of the work, published some time later, are more abstract and general in their reasoning.

Tocqueville deserves mention not only as a philosophical observer of other lands, but as a philosophical historian of his own country. *L'Ancien régime et la révolution* traces the causes of the Revolution and shows it to have been, in spite of the violence of the outbreak, the necessary conclusion of the nation's experience. For centuries matters had tended to the elimination of obstacles, of which royalty was the last and seemed most prominently objectionable.

Tocqueville is a cold and unimpassioned writer, but his statements are based on direct observation, and he carefully eschewed second-hand authorities, so that he produces the conviction of absolute sincerity. He belongs to the tradition of men like Montesquieu, but is without the latter's flippant *hors-d'œuvre*.

The name of Abel Villemain (1790–1870) takes us from history to literary criticism, or rather of literature in its historical setting. Villemain, who along with Guizot and Cousin was one of the most influential teachers in the France of his time, carried into practice some of the suggestions of Mme de Staël in her work *De la littérature*. He endeavored to present the author in his social and intellectual setting, often as its result. He did so in picturesque and gracefully ornate language, which betokened the rhetorician and public lecturer as much as the writer, but which made him the leader of a school. Villemain's chief work was the *Tableau de la littérature française au dix-huitième siècle*.

Saint-Marc Girardin (1801–1873) was of smaller calibre but widely popular in his day at the Sorbonne, where his *Cours de littérature dramatique* was a rambling exposition of moral sentiments in all ages of civilisation and an excuse for good-humored satire of the Romanticists.

Désiré Nisard (1806–1888) was the chief relic of the pure Classical tradition in criticism and the fierce rather than the good-humored foe of the Romanticists. In his *Histoire de la littérature française* he acknowledges no great period but the seventeenth century, and dogmatically asserts its qualifications

in the presentation of universal types. He analyses the *esprit classique*, with its qualities of clearness, precision, and logic, and illustrates it by the great authors of the age of Louis XIV, passing hurriedly over the earlier and the later periods.

The Restoration and the reign of Louis-Philippe are important in the development of journalistic criticism and periodical literature, especially of the cheap newspaper. The *Conservateur littéraire*, started by Victor Hugo and his brother in 1820, was the first organ of the Romanticists, and the short-lived *Minerve française* looked favoringly on their efforts, but the *Muse française*, also short-lived (1823–1824), is more closely connected with the movement. The *Globe*, founded in 1824, was at first a review of new books and of lectures, and, without being a partisan, encouraged the Romanticists as attempting the liberation of literary art. Its doctrines, said the programme of the paper, were "liberté et respect du goût national. . . . Laissons tenter toutes les expériences et ne craignons de devenir Anglais ni Germains." By 1830 the *Globe* became a liberal daily. Among more distinctly political papers the *National*, founded in 1830 by Thiers, Mignet, and Armand Carrel, waged war against the government of Charles X and helped on the Revolution of July. Carrel (1800–1836), one of the great liberal journalists of the century and the admirer of America, was killed in a duel by Emile de Girardin.

Under the reign of Louis-Philippe the power of the newspapers increased greatly.[1] Carrel soon passed to the opposition and continued until his death a vigorous onslaught on the govern-

[1] "La victoire de juillet étant en grande partie la victoire de la presse française, celle-ci devait naturellement en recueillir le bénéfice." — H. Avenel, *Histoire de la presse française*. The same author quotes Nettement's *Histoire de la litt. fr. sous le gouvernement de juillet* on this period, "où tout le monde devint journaliste: l'évêque, le grand seigneur, le magistrat, le militaire, le savant, l'ancien pair de France, l'ancien député, l'étudiant sortant des bancs de l'école, tous étendaient la main pour saisir le levier de la presse périodique, alors si puissant."

ment for being retrograde and not living up to the people's expectations. The *Journal des Débats* was the chief supporter of the government and the spokesman for the *bourgeoisie* in power, with contributors such as Saint-Marc Girardin, Silvestre de Sacy, Cuvillier-Fleury, Philarète Chasles, Michel Chevalier. Many of Jules Janin's *feuilletons* for the *Journal des Débats* form his *Histoire de la littérature dramatique*. The *Constitutionnel*, a dying newspaper, was bought by Dr. Véron, who built up success by the publication of Sue's *Juif errant* and later, under the second Republic, supported Louis-Napoleon. Dr. Véron's *Mémoires d'un bourgeois de Paris* contain much about the literary, social, and political life of his day. The *Gazette de France* and the *Quotidienne* were legitimist opposition papers. The *Globe* became the organ of the Saint-Simonists; Lamennais with Lacordaire directed the short-lived *Avenir;* Louis Veuillot, the "Catholic Juvenal," was editor of the *Univers*. Nor must one forget the pamphlets which Cormenin published under the name of "Timon."

Meanwhile there arose the cheap newspapers with a large circulation, the "journal à quarante francs," as against the old papers costing eighty francs a year. Such were the *Presse* of Emile de Girardin and the *Siècle*. These papers relied on advertisements and the *feuilleton* to raise a large circulation, and Emile de Girardin gathered about him as regular contributors Balzac, Dumas, Théophile Gautier, Sue, Scribe, Soulié, Sandeau, and his own wife Delphine Gay, who wrote the *Lettres parisiennes*. Among comic papers the *Charivari* and the *Caricature* pilloried Louis-Philippe as the pear-headed king.

Apart from the daily and weekly press there were reviews such as the *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, raised by François Buloz from mediocrity to a position even above that which it now holds. That autocratic editor gave an opening to talent, but made the greatest of his contributors feel his whip. His chief literary critic was the somewhat cantankerous Gustave Planche. The *Correspondant*, first established in 1828, has also lasted, with

some interruptions, until today and has always been a literary organ of the Catholics.

Under the second Republic there was a vast outbreak of ephemeral periodicals, some of them the mouthpieces of individual men of letters, such as the *Peuple constituant* of Lamennais, the *Ere nouvelle* of Lacordaire, the *Evénement* of Victor Hugo, the *Cause du peuple* of George Sand, who also wrote many of the *Bulletins de la République* of the minister Ledru-Rollin. In the *Peuple* Proudhon set forth with great vehemence his philosophic anarchism.

CHAPTER XII

THE SECOND HALF OF THE CENTURY. SAINTE-BEUVE, TAINE, AND RENAN

THE advent of the second Empire brought great changes in French society. They had in turn their repercussion in literature, where the exaggerations of Romanticism had already become wearisome. The political idealists had also suffered disenchantment in the failure of the Republic of 1848, founded on the true, the beautiful, and the good, and the coming to naught of the humanitarian sociological utopias. To many it seemed best to throw off responsibility, and to settle down to a life of materialism and of careless enjoyment under a benevolent despot. This materialism Napoleon III undertook to foster as contributing to the splendor of his reign. The French, and particularly the Parisians, were to be amused at all costs, and Napoleon III did more than any other ruler to give Paris the reputation for gaiety or frivolity which it has never lost, and which has perhaps been its misfortune as much as its good luck. The city was "beautified" and made more convenient, at the expense of much of its picturesqueness, by the prodigious activity of Baron Haussmann. The rebuilding made money flow into private pockets, though at the cost of national indebtedness. Meanwhile, showy court and popular entertainments, international exhibitions, and the advent from abroad of pleasure-seeking millionaires or "nabobs," of the type now called "rastaquouères," made the Parisians more self-centred than ever, by convincing them that the boulevards of the *Ville-Lumière* were the navel of the earth.[1]

[1] "La campagne, c'est bon pour les petits oiseaux," (Nestor Roqueplan); quoted by Arthur Meyer, *Ce que mes yeux ont vu*, p. 191.

The wit of the boulevards was the ideal of men of letters, and the *esprit parisien*, to which the *gaminerie* of the Musset dandyism had led up, was cultivated by all who could be wittily cynical and irreverent and express the spirit of burlesque and parody called *la blague*. The *Figaro*, the *Vie parisienne*, and the *Nain jaune* were newspapers giving voice to this form of wit; Aurélien Scholl, Nestor Roqueplan, and the naturalised German, Albert Wolff, were princes of *chroniqueurs*, and story-tellers like Gustave Droz, in *Monsieur, madame et bébé*, made the spirit of Crébillon *fils* modern. The Parisian newspapers in general were as narrow as their readers. Their meagre accounts of foreign campaigns were filled with panegyrics of the emperor as the liberator of nations, and the readers were entertained rather with legends of Fair Women, the marquise de Gallifet, the duchesse de Morny, the duchesse de Malakoff, of *demi-mondaines* like la Païva, of bacchantes like Pomaré, Céleste Mogador, or Rigolboche who danced the cancan at the Jardin Mabille. The second Empire was the age of the glorified courtesan or "femme entretenue," and Cora Pearl was the envy of more proper and virtuous *bourgeoises* than one might perhaps imagine. The young bohemian writers *à la Murger* thronged to the Brasserie des Martyrs on the slope of Montmartre,[1] and in the last years of the Empire the Café de Madrid was the home of political discussion. The Café Foy, the Café Riche, and Tortoni outshone those of the eighteenth century, and the "Librairie nouvelle" was a rendezvous for men of letters. On the stage the Gallicised German composer Jacques Offenbach developed the operetta or opera-bouffe, and in Hector Crémieux's *Orphée aux enfers* made the gods of Olympus dance the cancan, or continued the parody in Meilhac and Halévy's *la Belle Hélène*. *La Grande Duchesse de Gérolstein* by the same authors, which satirised drawing-room generals, and *Geneviève de Brabant* by Jaime

[1] Catulle Mendès introduced the Brasserie des Martyrs into his play *Glatigny*. There is a chapter on it in Philibert Audebrand's *les Derniers jours de la bohême*.

and Tréfeu made the actress Hortense Schneider the most talked-of woman in Europe. Meanwhile, the literary school of Realism and of Naturalism stood near the devotees of pleasure, like the warning slave near the Roman general in his triumph.

It need not be supposed that intellectual life stopped its course. The university vegetated and the provincial faculties slumbered, Cousin's anæmic eclecticism remained the official state philosophy; but the scholar and historian Victor Duruy, as minister of Public Instruction, accomplished what he could for higher and secondary teaching, and with Mérimée did the hard work on Napoleon's life of Julius Cæsar. Napoleon was a good-natured but not very well informed patron of letters, but the empress had Mérimée as a mentor, and the princesse Mathilde was a more cultured hostess at her *salon* even well into the third Republic. The convivial and conversation-loving men of letters continued to haunt places like the bohemian *salon* of Mme Sabatier, "la Présidente," or to group in unofficial *cénacles* as at the famous dinners in the Restaurant Magny, where met Sainte-Beuve, Taine, Renan, Flaubert, Gautier, Paul de Saint-Victor, Berthelot, and Turgenev. Here wit sharpened wit, and enough ideas were lavished over the banquets to supply a stolid nation like the English for several generations. We get a faint reproduction of these symposia in the Goncourt diary.

The Napoleonic splendor crumbled like a house of cards after the battle of Sedan, and the French had to add a new failure to the series of disillusions which had followed each other since the great Revolution. Few, except the proletarian demagogues and their followers, were now inclined to deny Flaubert's ejaculation that even that declaration of liberty and the rights of man had been a gigantic failure.[1] So there followed a period of acedia in the nation impoverished by the war of 1870 and the

[1] "Nous pataugeons dans l'arrière-faix de la Révolution qui a été un avortement, une chose ratée, un four, quoi qu'on dise." — Flaubert's correspondence during the Prussian war.

Commune, humbled before the eyes of the world and bereft of two of its fairest provinces. Some physiologists have thought they detected a trace of physical weakness, as of arrested growth, in the generation born of mothers who suffered mentally and sometimes physically amid the horrors of the *année terrible*. The national mentality became embittered and later found expression in the pessimistic and sordid Naturalism. On the other hand, even among the merry wits the French *blague* became less good-natured. The political animosities engendered by a parliamentary régime, and the rise of a proletariat jealous of the moneyed classes, did not contribute to a stable equilibrium of mutual respect. Naturalism was dead and buried long before 1900, but national crises like Boulangism, the Panama scandals, Jew-baiting and the Dreyfus case, as well as religious warfare and the disestablishment of the Church, have destroyed the coherence of literary movements and proved favorable to contemporary mediocrity.[1]

Three significant names express the most important influences in the literature of the second half of the nineteenth century: Sainte-Beuve, Taine, and Renan.

Charles-Augustin Sainte-Beuve (1804-1869) was in many respects the greatest literary critic France has produced. Yet his ambition was to be rather a poet and novelist, a creator instead of a commentator. His *Joseph Delorme*, a specimen of what has been called "bilious poetry," had, we have seen, more significance as a precursor of a peculiar kind of later poetry of the Baudelairian type than its own merits deserved. His other chief collections of verse, the *Consolations* and the *Pensées d'août*, gradually took the direction of the prosaic verse and

[1] A brief movement of neo-Christianity in the early nineties did not have fruition. It was connected with the names of Eugène Melchior de Vogüé, Paul Bourget, and was coincident with the papal encyclical of 1892 and the rallying to the Republic of the comte de Mun, etc. It had its literary repercussion in the "mysteries" of Maurice Bouchor and the *Samaritaine* of Rostand.

commonplace description of which François Coppée marks the culmination. The *Livre d'amour* was a rather indecent revelation of his love-affair with Hugo's wife, half-divulged while all the persons concerned were living. The novel *Volupté* was a similar instance of moral undressing and the revelation of "chastetés menteuses," and belongs to the category of *René*, *Obermann*, and the like. But these works date from the early half of his career.

Sainte-Beuve's first achievement was his critical study or *Tableau* of sixteenth-century literature, written under the influence of the Romantic movement and, in spite of the falseness of its premises, still a suggestive work. Sainte-Beuve passed through almost all the emotional impulses of his generation, and by the second Empire he had rallied to Bonapartism, for which he was violently attacked by the young students and hooted out of the lectureship to which he had been appointed at the Collège de France. His appearances as senator were almost the only interruption, in his later years, from the absorbing and Herculean toil to which he had devoted himself by the composition of his weekly critical article, forming the general collection of the *Causeries du lundi* and the *Nouveaux lundis*. During the first part of his life he had issued various volumes of *Critiques* and *Portraits*, which have much interest, but his fame rests particularly on his weekly contributions to the *Constitutionnel* and the *Moniteur officiel* as well as upon his *Port-Royal* and on *Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire*.

The history of Port-Royal consisted originally of lectures delivered at Lausanne, in Switzerland, in 1837–1838, when he was dabbling in religious thought, Calvinism, and Methodism. He began the study in a spirit of intense sympathy for the persecuted mystics, and the early volumes also contain valuable digressions on the general literary history of the seventeenth century. Before the last volume was ultimately published in 1867, Sainte-Beuve had tired of hair-splitting theologians and

narrow-minded nuns, and the tone verges on hostility rather than on sympathy.

The *Chateaubriand* was the outcome of a similar series of university lectures at Liège, in Belgium, in 1848. This work has an unfriendly tone throughout. Sainte-Beuve had always had pleasant relations with Chateaubriand and had been welcomed by Mme Récamier at the Abbaye-aux-Bois. But at that moment he was embittered by the apparent failure of many of his hopes and ambitions as compared with those of some of his contemporaries. His spleen vented itself on Chateaubriand, who had just died, and by showing that author in an unfriendly light he did his reputation a damage from which it took two generations to recover.

Sainte-Beuve's thought covered in his lifetime an extraordinary range. Beginning as a medical student and an embryo scientist he was at first a follower of the eighteenth-century philosophers and the physiologists. Then, becoming a Romanticist and a friend of Hugo, he went through a spiritualistic stage. After this he dabbled successively in Saint-Simonism, in Mennaisianism or the theories of Lamennais, in republicanism with Armand Carrel, in advanced socialism with Proudhon, and skirted Protestantism. By the time of the Revolution of 1848 his ardent interest in new causes had faded away into disappointment, and he soon settled down to the humdrum existence of writing and study. When he died he was a *libre penseur* or agnostic. The period 1832 to 1837 is perhaps the most significant for its intellectual richness and the consequent effect on his later life.

In literary criticism Sainte-Beuve, one of the greatest of critics, is one almost without a definite theory. He does not admit this, and in his essay on Chateaubriand in defence of his book, he sets forth his idea as to what criticism should be. It should be a sort of "histoire naturelle des esprits," a semi-scientific name which went well under the second Empire and fell in with the method of Taine. But instead of confining him-

self rigidly to three elements, like Taine who follows him, Sainte-Beuve wished to study every phase of the subject's personality or surroundings, to view him not merely in his race but in his immediate environment, his parents, his brothers and sisters, his children; in the different groups of friends and contemporaries through which he passes; in the moments of rise and fall of his talent; in his attitude toward religion, nature, women, money; in his weaknesses or vices; in his disciples and intellectual posterity. The method was, then, one of universal curiosity: there never was a more inquisitive nature than Sainte-Beuve, and the numerous persons whom he offended in the course of his life charged him with indecent prying and paying off grudges when his opponents were dead and unable to answer. Balzac, who hated him, said: "La muse de M. de Sainte-Beuve est de la nature des chauves-souris. . . . Sa phrase molle et lâche, impuissante et couarde, côtoie les sujets, . . . elle tourne dans l'ombre comme un chacal, elle entre dans les cimetières, . . . elle en rapporte d'estimables cadavres." A similar passage in the Goncourt diary says: "Quand j'entends Sainte-Beuve avec ses petites phrases, toucher à un mort, il me semble voir des fourmis envahir un cadavre; il vous nettoie une gloire en dix minutes, et laisse du monsieur illustre un squelette bien net." These are violent and unmerited words. It is true that Sainte-Beuve says somewhere himself that he gave up poetry and took to criticism and ripping up corpses ("éventrer des cadavres"), but he was no ghoul, only a Peeping Tom, especially of women.

Sainte-Beuve's method applies admirably to the study of secondary characters, and his sure judgment, his untiring industry and thoroughness make him the safest vicarious reader of all the minor personages of literature and history, whom the ordinary man can scarcely find time to study. With the greatest authors he is not always so successful: his sinuous appreciation fails to lift the individual above his contemporaries, and the shaded style with its unsystematic qualifications and rectifi-

cations — a sort of *marivaudage*, said Lamennais — becomes inconclusive. He is especially weak at general classifications covering whole periods or nations, and is at his best in individual portraits. Too often the reader does not distinguish the wood because of the trees, and the great genius remains undefined. None the less, a complete study of Sainte-Beuve's works is itself almost a liberal education in knowledge and in taste.

Sainte-Beuve did not create a genuine school. His method was too indistinct and his formulas were too vague, so that those who pretended to imitate him most closely, lacking his keenness and psychological analysis, tended to degenerate into anecdote and the description of trivial incidents. Of late the method has been applied to Sainte-Beuve himself, with dire consequences to his personal reputation. But if Sainte-Beuve was unsystematic, Taine was over-systematic.

Hippolyte Taine (1828–1893) is the great philosophical critic and historian of the second half of the nineteenth century. He does not stand in the first rank as a constructive metaphysician, but he had more effect on his times than more inventive talents. He was in youth an instance of the bold thinker, and at the Ecole normale he distinguished himself in one of the most brilliant classes of that school. His advanced views, however academic his method, got him into trouble with conservative official examiners, and his intellectual career was made difficult by failure at examinations.

During his adolescence Taine evolved a system, and it remained his weakness that he never got beyond it. To the very end of his life he insisted on making every fact enter under the headings of his categories, or if it did not, he neglected it. As a result his conclusions appear at first sight singularly plausible, even irrefutable; but it often does not take long to come upon an objection. None the less, Taine must not be called a sophist or said to be intentionally given to making the worse appear the better reason. Nobody could be more sincere, yet he could see things only in one way.

Taine is an example of the dogmatic classifier, the systematic and methodical thinker, in which respect he is a good representative of the *esprit classique* that he says so much about in his study of the origins of contemporary France, though he does not, like his fellow-critic, the literary historian Nisard, express an unqualifiedly favorable judgment.

Taine was a psychologist, whether of individuals or of races, but his psychology came from sources very different from the metaphysical postulates on which it rested. In psychology Taine was a descendant of Condillac and the materialists, in metaphysics he came from the same German imaginative thinkers who inspired the historians of the Romantic school.

The ultimate source of Taine's cosmological theories is to be found in the pantheist Spinoza, with whose geometrical method of thought he, the French logician, had also so much in common. But they were modified by contact with the German thinkers like Herder and Hegel, and even Goethe, who had transformed the static mechanism of the Spinozistic pantheism into the dynamism of a living organism. Taine was particularly interested in the history of society, and in the philosophy of Becoming of Hegel he found suggestions for his own theories of the dependence of historical moments on previous stages of human development, as well as the interrelation of the simultaneous parts of one civilisation expressed perhaps in remote phases of intellectual and social activity. Thus each people has its characteristic historical periods, typefied by some peculiar and epoch-making interior quality. This German in-forming spirit of an age is what Taine makes so much of as the *faculté maîtresse*.

Such a method of treating history by transforming nations into concrete bodies guided by the simplest laws has had in its day a wide vogue, and Taine got hints from the English writer Buckle as well as from the Germans. It has an appearance of simplicity which is sometimes misleading. It is often true enough, within limits, to say that "tout se tient" in a given period; it is less so to assume that one generation will pro-

duce another by mere development and not be modified by counteracting causes.

It will be observed that, so far, we have dealt with ultimate postulates and assumptions as to history. The next logical step is to analyse the data accounting for a given people or historical age and to explain its psychology. Taine, pre-eminently a psychologist, again illustrates the tendencies of the *esprit classique*, and he aims at explaining the psychology of a race as well as that of an individual.

Taine's psychology, of the type of Condillac, is opposed to intuitionalism. It is modified by contact with the English nominalists, such as John Stuart Mill, with whom he shared the theory that all our general ideas are reducible to signs or tokens. It was also akin to the positivism of Comte approached through Mill and Buckle. Comte, if he did not directly influence Taine, at least corroborated him in the feeling that psychology must rest on physiology, and not on the arbitrary pigeon-hole classification of the parts of the mind employed by the thinkers of the school of Cousin or of his Scotch prototypes. It was as a psychologist that Taine undertook to analyse the factors which determine the *faculté maîtresse* of an individual or a nation, and to classify it as the result of the influence of time, environment and race (*moment*, *milieu*, *race*). He had had many precursors in attributing effect to one or the other of these elements, whether Bodin, Montesquieu, Stendhal, Comte, Augustin Thierry, or even Sainte-Beuve, but the rigid combination into this form of deterministic cause and effect is due to Taine.

Determinism is also the key-word to Taine's ethical theory. His passion for classifying and for logical simplification on one principle made him consider even human activities as mere modes or forms of one single nature, which we have seen to be ultimately pantheistic. He connected nature, its history or development as a historical process, the cognition of its scientific laws, and the moral study of those human beings who are

a part of it. In other words, Taine ran together and confused metaphysics, psychology, physiology, and ethics as forms of science and made man seem the victim of the most rigid fatalism; a fatalism of which Taine did not fully accept the consequences, for, though his austere and gloomy nature saw in humanity the baser man or gorilla, he denied the charges of pessimism and of misanthropy and maintained the spiritual and moral responsibility of the individual. Taine's defenders have argued that he was a pessimist only as an observer of past history; as a philosopher he had the cult of the religion of science. The growth of knowledge and of true science would lead to the amelioration of man's condition, though Taine had very little hope even in that direction, far less than his more enthusiastic and optimistic predecessors. Meanwhile his best course of moral action seemed to him a stoical resignation after the fashion of Marcus Aurelius and obedience or passive yielding to the laws of nature, a process which since the days of the Greek philosophers has been called ataraxy (ἀταραξία).

Finally, it must not be forgotten in a survey of Taine's thought that he was an æsthetician as well as a psychologist. He was professor at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts and travelled in Italy. His philosophy of art is again influenced by Hegel's historical attitude, but his chief preoccupation is to classify or judge from the standpoint of the rigid and gloomy historical moralist, to describe, on the other hand, in the most vivid and concrete form. For Taine, in spite of his propensity toward logical classification, saw everything through the evocation of images, and the picturesqueness of his whole style, historical and philosophical, is due to the distinctness with which he visualised the "petits faits significatifs," the union of which was to prove his theory.

The gist of Taine's method lies, therefore, in the theory of the three factors, time, place, and environment, which determine the chief faculty. This faculty once distinguished serves to explain the character or characters under discussion. The

defects of the method have been so often pointed out and are so obvious that one hesitates to repeat them, were it not that its apparent clearness and simplicity made it for a time have many believers. The theory of the three factors leaves unaccounted for the personality of the individual genius, and could lead one logically to conclude that every person born at the same time and place and of the same race as La Fontaine would be a genius similar to him. Nor can a complex human character be explained in every case by a single dominant factor. Finally, the gathering of "petits faits significatifs" in support of a theory led to the giving of similar weight to facts of very different intrinsic importance and to the neglect of other equally significant contradictory facts.

Taine's writings are numerous and varied. His most important discussion of the human understanding is contained in his work *De l'Intelligence*. In an earlier study, *les Philosophes français au XIXe siècle*, he had pulled to pieces the vapid eclecticism of Cousin and the conventional philosophers; in *l'Intelligence* he enunciated an advanced sensationalism, according to which ideas are signs or images of recurrent or surviving sensation. He wrote various works on the philosophy of art in different countries and on travel in the Pyrenees and in Italy, in which his powers of description are put at the service of his theories of moral, historical, and æsthetic appreciation. His ideas of the three factors and of the chief faculty to explain men and societies come out in his studies of La Fontaine, of Livy, and particularly in his *Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, an extraordinarily plausible and yet an impossible analysis of English character and of its reproduction in the great writers. The imaginary life of Frédéric-Thomas Graindorge is a work of social satire and moral comment.

But Taine's most important historical study is *les Origines de la France contemporaine*. As he is dealing with his own country the excellences and mistakes of the study are the more significant. To him the spirit of the French Revolution is the last

expression of the rigid *esprit classique*, an explanation now recognised to be grotesquely inaccurate. On the other hand, his fierce and almost vindictive attitude toward the mob leaders of the Revolution, due in great part to his own distress at the sight of similar violences of the Commune while he was writing, had at least the good result of stripping off the halo of idealism which modern demagogues had tried to throw over even the Jacobins and Terrorists. To the technical historian his misuse of authorities and his lack of training in the study of documents make his work an object of mistrust.

Taine, though not a great creator, was a great even if defective interpreter, and he impressed his ideas on many of his generation. Not only did he make theories of positivism or materialism current, but he supplied critics and historians with a method so simple that they were able to reproduce it with monkey-like fidelity. Finally, his influence passed into *belles-lettres:* the Realists are counterparts of Taine and the Naturalists are his disciples. The gloom of Taine was in harmony with the pessimism of the Realists, and his determinism was adopted by Zola and his school, who repeated Taine's custom of collecting facts as material for their works, and with him believed in the absolute dependence of the moral life upon the physical life and the environment. Their application of Taine's theory led them to employ in fiction the methods of the physiologist. Taine was far from approving disciples such as Zola, because the pretence of scientific impartiality enabled them to suppress morality and adduce a pseudo-scientific excuse for their pornography. None the less his influence on them cannot be denied.

Ernest Renan (1823–1892) shares with Taine the position of the most pervasive literary influence during the second half of the nineteenth century. He is especially significant as the representative of an intellectual temper, to which the name of Renanism is given.

Renan was born of mixed Breton and Gascon stock in the little out of the way cathedral town of Tréguier in Brittany.

Sensitive and feminine in feeling, he was destined by his mother and elder sister Henriette for the priesthood. His diligence in study won the attention of his teachers and he became a pupil of the seminary of Saint-Nicolas-du-Chardonnet in Paris, directed by the great ecclesiastic Mgr Dupanloup. At the higher schools of Issy and Saint-Sulpice he pursued the study of Semitic languages and history, gradually finding it more difficult to accept without questioning the religious attitude of his masters. Finally, in 1845, Renan, encouraged by his sister, left the seminary and gave up his prospect of a career. Fame came to him, however, very rapidly. He won his doctorate in 1852 by a thesis on *Averroès et l'Averroïsme*, dealing with the Aristotelianism of the Arabs of the Middle Ages, and composed important works on the philology of the Semitic languages and the history of religions. During an exploring expedition to Phœnicia in 1860–1861, Renan, now married, lost by fever his sister, whose self-sacrificing nature he afterward commemorated in *Ma sœur Henriette*. Appointed in 1862 professor of Semitic philology at the Collège de France he was revoked soon after as an indirect consequence of the scandal created by the *Vie de Jésus* and received the post again only after the Franco-Prussian war. During the last years of his life his publications, his lectures, and his tardily developed propensity for society made him the intellectual lion of Paris.

If Taine is the nineteenth-century embodiment of the *esprit classique* or its modern equivalent tinged with doctrines of evolution, Renan, originally a follower of Rousseau, may not inappropriately be called the philosopher of neo-Romanticism, of impressionism as opposed to dogmatism, of intellectual egoism. Absolutely at variance with the spirit of French Classicism, he was more at home in a dreamy, half-sensuous spiritual environment such as he found in memories of his native storm-beaten Brittany or in the mystical side of the Catholic Church and in its cathedrals and ritual. But, being deprived of a definite object of worship, he was constrained to replace it by a lay cult and by the

religion of science seen particularly under the manifestations of history and the growth of language.

Renan's interest in history was first awakened by reading Michelet, but he became specifically the interpreter of a somewhat shapeless philosophy based on the ideas of the German thinkers, who to him possessed the key to the secret of the universe. In so far as Renan had lost faith in the supernatural he was a positivist of the type of the anti-metaphysical Comte. On the other hand, not only had he imbibed the critical spirit of Kant, but more particularly ideas of Herder and of Hegel. With Herder he believed in a life of humanity developing in obedience to an inner autonomous instinct, with Hegel he assumed the immanence of the absolute, namely the growth of God in the world instead of his being an outer cause. Fichte, Schelling, and various German philologists were influences on Renan. For he could thus justify history as that form of science accounting for the progress, evolution, or "becoming" of the world. To know things is to know their transformations, hence the historical method is the method of individual sciences and of science in general. Science is itself a religion, and the truest philosopher is he who has knowledge. The direct influence of Hegelianism in detail on Renan must not, however, be exaggerated, for Hegel was a metaphysician and Renan was not. It was one of general spirit rather than of matters of detail.

Renan, as a liberal of 1848, was a believer in progress. In its concrete manifestations this meant the organisation of humanity in accordance with the conclusions reached by philology, which Renan interprets not as the science of words and syllables, but as the whole intellectual expression of the historical laws of mankind. Spiritually, progress implies the advance of the idea of God toward its fulfilment. Humanity creates reason, the Absolute is created in reason, God is the category of the ideal toward which the world tends, God is never complete but always in progress, and man's immortality is, in so far as he par-

ticipates in the general rather than in the individual, "becoming" of God.

Thus Renan's philosophy shows itself as a somewhat indeterminate creed suitable for a man of letters rather than for a technical metaphysician or logician, yet reproducing, with an inclination toward the study of history, the different doctrines then in vogue of *fieri*, of which Darwinism has been the most celebrated instance in the nineteenth century. Renan recorded the ideas of his youth in *l'Avenir de la science*, written in 1848, but which he actually left unpublished until 1890. This work contains, however, in germ the philosophy of his life and the ideas which he expressed in all his miscellaneous writings.

An exposition of Renan's thought is bound to lend him an appearance of rigidity which he never possessed, for no more fleeting will-o'-the-wisp ever existed. Though he never ceased to practise accuracy of study and industry, though he was more proud of his *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* than of his other achievements, yet he was always ready to welcome and to enjoy every new phase of thought. A certain priestly unctuousness of disposition, which never left him even though his seminary days grew remote, inclined him to meet his critics with concessions rather than with objections; his sympathy and universality of interests, and yet his ironical consciousness of the incompleteness of his own and of his adversaries' arguments, made him in a discussion a more ready eclectic than Cousin, in admitting the grain of truth to be found in any system; his mental suppleness led him sometimes to embark at random upon a current of thought without consideration of the conclusion, knowing that at any rate he could attain something plausible. This attitude of mind or *état d'âme* bears the name of Dilettanteism, a term almost always interpreted in English in a sense less favorable than Renan deserved. In his case it meant universal interest, but was not inconsistent with thoroughness and accuracy. It is only in the minor dilettantes, or at most in the Renan of his

last years, that superficiality is implied, and it corresponds perilously with the intellectual dandyism of people like Barbey d'Aurevilly. Then, indeed, Renan, unconsciously disillusioned at the non-materialisation of his hopes of progress and disheartened after the war of 1870 at the shattering of his ideals about Germany, took the attitude of the artist pleased by his sensations, admiring the spectacular show of history, and even began to picture God as the supreme dilettante enjoying the universe. Moreover, the artist was an aristocrat in temperament: the importance of knowledge in the world made it essential that the philosopher alone should be king (Romantic *mépris du bourgeois*), and that the ordinary commonplace individual should be of no importance. The feeling of the priesthood of science made him see in the lay pontiff's rôle the same superiority as in the spiritual director of religion, and scorn ignorant democracies or the vulgar quest of money and the materialism of peoples such as the Americans.

For weal or woe the influence of Renan in modern France has been very great. To the smaller number, the scholars and the intellectual élite to which he himself belonged, he is important among those who have given the history of religions standing among the sciences; to the majority he represents and is largely responsible for an attitude of mind frequently met with in the second half of the nineteenth century. Renanism by its brilliant intellectualism pleased jugglers in words and ideas; by its sacerdotalism freed from religion it tickled the æsthetic taste; its irony, refusing to take opponent or self too seriously, was a more aristocratic form of *blague*. Finally, the attitude of detachment, becoming a disintegrating force in religion and morals, encouraged at any rate the so-called creed of "je m'en fichisme," or "Don't-care-a-damn" philosophy of discouragement and disillusion, found among the "fin-de-siècle" attitudes. Not that Renanism was necessarily fatal to all men: some typical Renanists have taken militant parts in national politics during struggles such as the Dreyfus case, some from aristocrats have

become socialists and proletarians. But this has been an evolution beyond pure Renanism.

The studies of Renan included not only the history of all ages, but mythology, linguistics, philosophy, politics, and literary criticism as well. His chief works to the student of letters were, besides those already mentioned, the history of early Christianity, of the people of Israel, the *Drames philosophiques*, and the *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse.*

The *Vie de Jésus*, first volume of the *Origines du Christianisme*, was largely composed during the journey to the East, when the author was without many books of reference. It caused a tremendous scandal by its interpretation of Christ and the transformation of him from a divinity into the "charmant docteur" and an amiable human being. Nowadays the book is interesting chiefly as a sort of historical romance into which, amid the environment of a Holy Land seen by the romantic interpreter of nature, the author places beings whom Christianity has worshipped for centuries, but who become the embodiments of Renanism or the butt of its irony. Jesus is an ignorant Syrian peasant, honored as the creator of the greatest of religions, yet not exempt from occasional deceit to further his ends and even having, as Renan says in a later volume (*l'Antéchrist*), "le don de sourire de son œuvre." The other volumes of the series, with perhaps more accurate erudition, bring the history of the early Christians down to the times of Marcus Aurelius. Throughout them all there runs, nevertheless, the subjective strain. If Jesus has in him much of Renan himself, the author sees in St. Paul, the "laid petit Juif," abrupt and dogmatic, the antithesis of everything sympathetic, and he likes to think of him also convinced at last of the vanity of his dogmatism and awakening to disillusion. The *Histoire du peuple d'Israël*, written after the story of the rise of Christianity, between 1887 and his death, rationalises the Old Testament history and continues, as in the previous work, the analysis of ethnic psychology.

To Renan's later years, between 1878 and 1886, also belong

the *Dialogues philosophiques*, (*Caliban*, *l'Eau de Jouvence*, *le Prêtre de Némi*, *l'Abbesse de Jouarre*), which are the most characteristic examples of his dilettanteism or juggling with contradictories and antinomies. The last one expresses a rather unpleasant awakening of the sexual obsession from which Renan had always bragged of immunity. The *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse*, haphazard recollections of legends heard in childhood, of youthful experiences, and of travel, are among the most attractive of Renan's writings.

Ernest Renan was one of the greatest masters of French literature. Vivid and picturesque in expression without loss of clearness and limpidity, he deserves immortality if only for his style. The neo-Romanticist was in this respect a pure Classicist.

CHAPTER XIII

FICTION

REALISM, which took the place of Romanticism, is the literary equivalent of the imperial age of materialism which we have described, and Naturalism is its acute form. Realism was the product of a period which had gradually got rid of the ideal, which called itself scientific and found its expression in positivism rather than in the poetry of metaphysics. The Naturalist prided himself on employing the methods of science, on introducing physiology into fiction, on being a disciple of Taine and of Claude Bernard.

In the beginning the Realists contented themselves with observing life, as a reaction against the fantastical literature of their predecessors, and the doctrine of "liberty in art" underwent modifications. But they were often Romanticists at heart, as Flaubert or Zola, and Dumas *fils's* first great play was the Romantic rehabilitation of the courtesan. Some writers, following Gautier, took a fastidious and almost finical pleasure in reproducing objects, a method which was termed "art for art's sake." It was the impassive objectivity of the Parnassians. Others, like Dumas *fils*, hitched to their method a theory of morals and affected to teach man to be better by showing the evil consequences of vice. To read a novel describing sin was to have an effect similar to vaccination against smallpox. The fallacy in this method of reasoning lies in the fact that the excitement of the senses is pleasurable and requires a stronger prophylactic than a book. All cannot resist the ordeal of St. Anthony.

The actual experience of the Naturalistic writer illustrates

what has been said. Posing first as a copyist of nature, he finds that the masterpiece of artistic realism is more difficult to accomplish than he had supposed, that Flaubert, with a life of toil, wrote only one *Madame Bovary*. Desirous of avoiding the mechanical daguerrotype or photograph in his reproduction, he is led to portray the abnormal, the real but exceptional, convinced that thus he can attract attention. So he haunts the hospital and the Salpêtrière, the dramshop and the brothel and dwells among the lowest passions of humanity, until, as with the hero of Musset's *Lorenzaccio*, they cling to him like the shirt of Nessus. Thus Zola loses all sense of proportion, and with his proneness to exaggeration he piles up descriptions of vice until he can see in humanity no atom of goodness: "Voilà donc ce qu'il faut constater: notre analyse reste toujours cruelle, parce que notre analyse va jusqu'au fond du cadavre humain. En haut, en bas, nous nous heurtons à la brute. Certes, il y a des voiles plus ou moins nombreux; mais quand nous les avons décrits les uns après les autres, et que nous levons le dernier, on voit toujours derrière plus d'ordures que de fleurs." (*Le Roman expérimental*). "La bête humaine est la même partout," he says later in the same book. Similarly, the Goncourt brothers become so morbid that one of them records in his diary his inability to see in marriage anything but "l'image d'un monsieur et d'une dame dans leur lit, la conjonction corporelle par-dessus les blonds petits cheveux de l'enfant; et l'enfant arrive à me faire l'effet d'un phallus dessiné sur les murs." There is no greater writer than the sane Realist. He not only sees life as it is, but in his descriptions and choice of incident must make artistic selection; hence his task is more difficult than that of the old Romanticist who used the incidentals of the grotesque or the exotic, more difficult than that of the modern Idealist who can let his fancy play without control. There is no worse perverter of art and nature than the French Naturalist, because, as Meredith says of St. Simeon Stylites, he "sees only the hog in Nature and then takes Nature for the hog." Naturalism

had the pessimism and exaggeration of the unreal Romanticism and was, in some cases, hypocritical besides.

Balzac is frequently called the founder of Realism. But if we remember that he had in him something of the Romanticist, that owing to his days and nights of continuous toil his actual experience of real life was small and his characters were due to his constructive imagination, that his work was over by 1850, then we shall call him rather an ancestor of Realism as Chateaubriand was the forefather of Romanticism. Balzac's literary acolyte Charles de Bernard (1804–1850), author of *Gerfaut*, a study of literary and artistic life, belongs also to the preliminary period. The *Vie de bohême* of Henry Murger (1822–1861) gave an immortal picture of student life in the old Latin Quarter, and the exploits of Rodolphe and Schaunard, of Mimi and Musette have lived on even to Puccini's opera. Murger's bohemians were the unpractical and impecunious children of the rebels of 1830, who had considered themselves the masters of creation. But, though having the same scorn of the *bourgeois*, they had undergone the decadence which was the lot in real life of Gérard de Nerval: the doublet of Gautier had become a threadbare coat and unblacked shoes. Murger had the bad effect of making callow French students take themselves too seriously and of lending a glamour of sentiment to silly *liaisons*. The greatest novel of Realism was written by Flaubert, and even he had in him much of the Romanticist.

There were, however, other influences operative in France. The drift toward Realism had its wider aspect in the influence of the scientific movement in England as well as in France, expressed in works such as Darwin's *Origin of Species*, and the novels of the English Realists Dickens and Thackeray, well known in France through translations and the studies of Emile Montégut, not to speak of Taine's history of English literature (1863). Realism had made its appearance in art in such paintings as Courbet's *Enterrement à Ornans* (1851). Thought in

all its forms became impregnated with the spirit of positivism, and the later Naturalists sought corroboration of their views in Comte, Littré, Spencer, or Bentham.

Meanwhile there was a writer named Edmond Duranty (1833–1880), said to be a natural son of Mérimée, scarcely remembered now except for the praise given him by Zola in his *Romanciers naturalistes*. He composed several novels, of which the best is *le Malheur d'Henriette Gérard*, a heroine something after the type of Emma Bovary, and for a year or two (1856–1857) he edited a militant anti-Romantic review called *le Réalisme*. Duranty defined his doctrine of Realism as "la reproduction exacte, complète, sincère, du milieu social, de l'époque où l'on vit, parce qu'une telle direction d'études est justifiée par la raison, les besoins de l'intelligence et l'intérêt du public, et qu'elle est exempte de tout mensonge, de toute tricherie." Zola, as an insignificant publisher's clerk, knew Duranty and doubtlessly got in part from him literary theories to which he tried to give scientific corroboration.

Gustave Flaubert (1821–1880) was a well-to-do Norman and spent the last thirty-four years of his life, except for brief absences, in his country house on the Seine at Croisset near Rouen. His age was burdened with loneliness and a dreadful malady, epilepsy or "hysterico-neurasthenia," which made him dread to go abroad. He was by nature inclined to the melancholy and morbid gloom usually connected with Romanticism, and he made life harder than it need have been by the toil which he spent on his style, laboring to eliminate blemishes which no one else would have perceived.[1] It was the tragic irony of this *bourgeois*-hater's life that it had almost all the elements of *bourgeois* method. Flaubert's correspondence is full of allusions to his laborious composition, his "gueulades,"

[1] "Des métaphores on passe aux assonances, — une assonance, au dire de Flaubert, devant être évitée, quand même on devrait passer huit jours entiers à y arriver." — Goncourt diary, Vol. I. p. 178.

as he toilingly transformed a rough outline into a finished composition, declaiming at the top of his voice the sentences he composed and writhing in physical agony: "My throat is raw from having yelled all the evening in writing." This is what he called "les affres du style." Yet Flaubert was naturally a slovenly writer, as his slangy, disconnected, and off-hand letters to George Sand go to show.

Madame Bovary (1857) is perhaps the greatest work of fiction that the nineteenth century has produced. It is purely objective and attains the impersonality which Flaubert advocated, but which even he himself rarely acquired. Flaubert, the son of a physician of the Rouen hospitals and brought up in a scientific environment, was interested in physiology and believed that the human soul was to be studied "avec l'impartialité qu'on met dans les sciences physiques." The author should stand aside and watch the "determinism of facts." In *Madame Bovary* Flaubert lets pass before the reader's eyes the scenes and incidents of a small Norman town. In place of the long-winded disquisitions of George Eliot's *Middlemarch* he refrains from judgment, and we see the people of Yonville for ourselves. In the character of M. Homais, the local apothecary, incarnation of a provincial Joseph Prudhomme, half-educated and convinced that his superficial Voltairianism is the last word in philosophy, Flaubert has depicted to perfection the mentality of that narrow-minded *bourgeoisie* with which France, like other countries, was filled and which had not even the advantages of Paris. Mme Bovary herself is the portrait of the sentimental woman of that same class. Emile Montégut called the whole book a *Don Quixote* of Romanticism in which the author ridicules the romantic frenzy, and he draws a parallel between its effect and that of the *Précieuses ridicules* on preciosity. Emma Bovary, commonplace and vulgar by nature, yet yearning for emotion, is tied down in marriage to a still more mediocre but self-satisfied country physician. In her quest for a true lover she falls lower and lower in adultery until her suicide. The novel was accused

of immorality and was the object of a sensational prosecution by the authorities, in which Flaubert was acquitted. Though undoubtedly written, in spite of his lawyer's rhetoric, without moral aim and merely as a picture of life — and Flaubert maintained that "art has no morality" — it may be considered a less perverted work than many of its Romantic predecessors. less repulsive than the Naturalistic novels of Zola and the Goncourt brothers, and the most truthful picture ever made of mediocrity in France.

The contrast is noteworthy between *Madame Bovary* and *Salammbô*, a magnificent failure, laboriously evolved and tedious. From modern France we are carried back to ancient Carthage where, on the basis of a brief journey of exploration, Flaubert tried to reconstruct a vanished civilisation of which practically nothing is known. But erudite description could not give life to a literary skeleton. Nobody cared for the loves of Salammbô. daughter of Hamilcar Barca and priestess of Tanit, for the Lybian mercenary Mathos, and *Salammbô*, far from having the interest of an historical novel by Scott, has not even that of a Kingsley's *Hypatia*.

Flaubert made a return to Realism with the *Education sentimentale*, in the chief character of which, Frédéric Moreau, we get the male counterpart of Mme Bovary. His various amorous experiences do not end in Emma's tragedy but in a flat mediocrity, which is again more painfully effective than the filth of the Naturalists.

La Tentation de saint Antoine, a sort of opium dream which was long in Flaubert's mind but did not appear until 1874, is once more an instance of erudition applied to the imagination. Among his short stories *Un cœur simple* is the portrayal of the uninspired but pathetic fidelity of an old Norman servant; *Hérodias*, on the contrary, with its ornate Orientalism, is the ultimate source of Oscar Wilde's *Salome* and the opera of Strauss. A third story is the *Légende de saint Julien l'Hospitalier*. Flaubert's last unfinished book, *Bouvard et Pécuchet*, is a work of

decadence, the caricature of his cruel portraits of the narrow-minded *bourgeois*.

Thus Flaubert proves to be a cross between the Romanticist and the Realist, or a Romanticist by temperament reacting against his own nature and producing the masterpiece of the opposite school.

Fanny, by Ernest Feydeau (1821–1873), was a novel published in 1858 which, though now neglected, had for a time an extraordinary vogue. Coming immediately after *Madame Bovary* and exemplifying the same differentiation between art and morality, it is one of the important examples of the early Realistic school, though the author, like Flaubert again, had a Romantic imagination, and the book seems as much an experience as Constant's *Adolphe*. The subject is a youth's frenzied jealousy against the husband of the mature woman whom he loves, and its passionate voluptuousness combined with crudeness of detail cause it to be classed as a work of "poetic Realism."

Edmond de Goncourt (1822–1896) and Jules de Goncourt (1830–1870) were two fussy bachelors who thought themselves the creators of Naturalism, or at least the surviving brother took for them the credit of having been such. In reality their outlook on life was in the highest degree limited and they saw only the surface of things: an impressionistic description of unpleasant details did not give them the right to consider themselves the leaders of a new movement or, as it is expressed in their diary, the John the Baptists of "la nervosité." This aloofness from the world they feel, at times, themselves:

"Puis entre nous et ce monde, il y a un fossé. Notre pensée vivant au-dessus des choses bourgeoises, a de la peine à descendre au terre-à-terre de la pensée ordinaire, tout entière alimentée par les basses réalités de la vie et la matérialité des événements journaliers. Oui, nous sommes de ce monde, nous en avons le langage, les gants, les bottes vernies, et cependant nous y sommes dépaysés et mal à l'aise, comme les gens déportés dans une colonie, dont les colons n'auraient que les dehors à notre portée, mais l'âme à cent lieues de la nôtre."

For a long time their interest was in the art and manners of the eighteenth century and of the Revolution, and Edmond de Goncourt became enamored of Japanese art, so that their whole literary spirit was the meticulous observation of externals, the taste for bric-à-brac and bibelot. Their talent had the minuteness of water-color artists unexpectedly applied. For instead of confining themselves to the period of Watteau and Boucher, they turned in fiction to modern times and dreamed of books which should be "une clinique médico-littéraire de ces maladies de foie, de cœur, des poumons, si liées et si attenantes aux sentiments et aux idées du malade, et présenterait toutes les révolutions de l'âme dans la souffrance du corps." So these self-centred nervous valetudinarians undertook to portray human passions by studying the infinitely minute and recording the tiny anecdote. The chief result, apart from the pathological characteristics which their novels share with those of the other chief Naturalists, was the *écriture artiste*. This was really the reverse of Flaubert's method. Where he labored to avoid the dissonance of three prepositions in "de l'eau de fleur d'oranger," the Goncourts, on the contrary, thought that style must correspond to the passing thrills or sensations and be as incoherent, nervous, and spasmodic as they. The resultant effect is, none the less, a strikingly artificial one, because, far from being impersonal like that of the true Realist Flaubert, it is the most personal style imaginable and seems to express a new preciosity of emotion, something like that "civet-cat style" which John Addington Symonds criticises in Walter Pater, though it is a preciosity of nervous fussiness instead of an Alexandrian mannerism.

Thus the Goncourt brothers present the peculiar contrast of writers by temperament fastidiously aloof from the world who try to portray its most degrading aspects. The solution to the puzzle lies in the morbidness of their nature. The gradual degeneration of a faithful and trusted servant to prostitution, the progress of consumption, the phases of insanity, are topics in which they delight. The undressing of the minds of their

characters is equalled only by the nakedness of the diary, especially that of the surviving brother.

The novels of the Goncourts were written in common, each one composing the same incident first by himself and the results being moulded into one, so that until the death of Jules their work cannot be separated. Their chief novels are *Sœur Philomène*, a story of the hospitals; *Renée Mauperin; Germinie Lacerteux*, the servant sinking to degradation; *Manette Salomon*, the Jewish artist's model playing the human vampire's part; *Madame Gervaisis*. Edmond de Goncourt wrote alone *la Fille Elisa*, another study of prostitution; *les Frères Zemganno*, which has some true pathos because, under the story of the two inseparable acrobats can be read the tragedy of one Goncourt bereft by death of his brother; *la Faustin;* and *Chérie*. For many years their novels sold poorly, but the production of their play *Henriette Maréchal* in 1865 was the occasion of literary manifestations which, though the play was a failure, gave them notoriety and pecuniary success.

The *grenier* of the Goncourts was the resort of a band of disciples, and the surviving one left the money resulting from the sale of his artistic collections to found an academy of ten, the Académie des Goncourt, which has provided an increase of income and an annual dinner to a set of writers a little below the calibre of the Académie française, but which has had no effect on French literature.

If we call Flaubert the greatest Realist, Zola is the greatest Naturalist, though he is one of the dullest writers in French literature. He is also one of the most consistent in his literary theories. Zola, who had read Claude Bernard's *Introduction à l'étude de la médecine expérimentale* and Dr. Lucas's *Traité de l'Hérédité naturelle*, called his novel the "roman expérimental," he asserted its method to be based on Claude Bernard so closely that it is often sufficient merely to replace the word "médecin" by "romancier," and he defined it as follows, in contrast with the idealistic novel:

Nous montrons le mécanisme de l'utile et du nuisible, nous dégageons le déterminisme des phénomènes humains et sociaux, pour qu'on puisse un jour dominer et diriger ces phénomènes. En un mot, nous travaillons avec tout le siècle à la grande œuvre qui est la conquête de la nature, la puissance de l'homme décuplée. Et, voyez, à côté de la nôtre, la besogne des écrivains idéalistes, qui s'appuient sur l'irrationel et le surnaturel, et dont chaque élan est suivi d'une chute profonde dans le chaos métaphysique. C'est nous qui avons la force, c'est nous qui avons la morale. (*Le Roman expérimental.*)

The writing of fiction is, therefore, an impartial physiological study of individual and collective phenomena.

Apart from the question of morality which, by concession, may be left out of consideration as a mask of Anglo-Saxon hypocrisy, modern French Naturalism, like that of Zola, is reprehensible, because both morbid and obscene. The burlesque and libertine Realists of the early seventeenth century were as obscene as Zola, but they were not disintegrants; the Jansenist Racine was as gloomy in his determinism as the "homme hypocondre" Zola, yet he did not overstep the reserve of his Classicism. It took a nineteenth-century author and a spirit at times akin to Zola, Jean Richepin, to render the idea of fate or μοῖρα by the delicate comparison of life to a drunken prostitute reeling through space:

Rien, nulle part, ne reste coi.
O flots de l'éternelle houle,
La Vie est une putain soûle
Qui dans l'espace hurle et roule
Sans savoir comment ni pourquoi.

Zola interprets gaiety only as *polissonnerie* ("Je ne me sens pas gai du tout, pas aimable, pas polisson, incapable de chatouiller les dames") and thinks that the more bestiality he describes, the more he is unveiling the hearts of men, the more he is trying to "chercher en eux la bête, ne voir même que la bête" (Preface of *Thérèse Raquin*). It is not necessary to consider Zola a pornographic writer for money-making alone, like many of his followers: he seems not to have understood mankind otherwise.

Yet Emile Zola (1840–1903), together with this gigantic pessimism which links Naturalism to the Romantic school, had the magnificence of a Romantic imagination. He admired Hugo and was never free from what his dissentient apostles of the *Manifeste des Cinq* called an "enflure hugolique." In early youth he planned a nebulous philosophical epic poem of humanity in the spirit of Quinet, Leroux, and Fourier, and he ended his career by socialistic and proletarian novels harking back again to the ideas of Fourier, Cabet, and Considérant. In between he composed the vast prose epic of human bestiality called *les Rougon-Macquart*, permeated with scorn and contempt for the workman and peasant.

Zola's early life was a hard struggle against poverty, afterward followed by a period as clerk of the publisher Hachette. His first work was the *Contes à Ninon* (1864); his first novel *la Confession de Claude*. He became a critic of literature and art (*Mes Haines* and *Mon Salon*) as a defender of Realism and Impressionism. In 1867 came his first important novel, *Thérèse Raquin*, but it was not until much later that his friendships developed into the group of Médan, where Zola had his country house, a school composed chiefly of Paul Alexis, Henry Céard, Léon Hennique, J.-K. Huysmans, and Guy de Maupassant, authors of *les Soirées de Médan*. Other followers of Zola, now or later, were Edouard Rod, Octave Mirbeau, Paul Margueritte, Gustave Guiches, the two brothers who wrote under the name J.-H. Rosny, Lucien Descaves, Paul Bonnetain. It was the last five, counting the Rosnys as one, who in 1887, on the publication of *la Terre*, cut loose from Zola in a sensational manifesto.

Just before the fall of the Empire Zola began to plan his series of novels which were to be for the second Empire what Balzac's *Comédie humaine* had been to the first half of the century. They developed into a succession of onslaughts on the society of the fallen reign, in theory a scientific study of heredity, in fact an *a priori* and artificial scheme.

The problem was to show the "histoire naturelle et sociale

d'une famille sous le second empire," in the morbid taints infecting all the descendants of one crazy and degenerate Adelaïde Fouque of Plassans (a name disguising the town of Aix in Provence where Zola spent some of his youth), in the different spheres of life to which they belong: public official, peasant, miner, workman, *bourgeois*, soldier, scholar, artist, servant, harlot. Beginning with *la Fortune des Rougon*, published in 1871, the series extended through twenty volumes to *le Docteur Pascal* in 1893. Among the most important were *le Ventre de Paris; l'Assommoir*, on drink; *Nana*, on the courtesan, a book which a wit said made Naturalism into "Nanaturalism"; *Germinal*, on mines and strikes; *la Terre*, on the life of the peasantry, and the climax of unnecessary obscenity; *le Rêve*, an attempt to show that Zola could be pure; *l'Argent;* and *la Débâcle*, the masterpiece, on the Franco-Prussian war.

After the *Rougon-Macquart* series Zola wrote the trilogy *les Trois villes*, portraying the influence of the priesthood among the ignorant pilgrims of Lourdes, in Rome, centre of Catholicism, in Paris. After his brave intervention in the Dreyfus affair on the side of justice by the famous letter to President Félix Faure, known as *J'accuse*, Zola, now turning toward the proletariat which he had once vilified, planned four social gospels in the form of novels: *Fécondité*, against race-suicide; *Travail*, on the amelioration of the artisan's life; *Vérité*, founded on the Dreyfus case. The concluding volume, *Justice*, was never written.

As the years go by, Zola's novels, always ponderous, are becoming more and more unreadable. They were the result of diligent note-taking carried to the extent of tediously minute description (*Rome* is a guide-book of eight hundred pages), and the tenacious quest for filth wearies even the most assiduous seeker after it. Zola's perception of smell, particularly the bad smell or stench, is extraordinary.

Zola most closely approaches grandeur when he is least realistic and draws near to Romanticism. At times his characters, in spite of minute documentation (the "document humain"),

become symbols, and Nana in the episode of the horse-races hovers over the scene as the enthroned courtesan who typefied the vice of the second Empire. The description of a crowd or a collective force sometimes approaches epic grandeur, except where Zola's lack of humor made him, as it did Hugo, occasionally step over into the ludicrous. In *Germinal* or *la Débâcle* the mob is shown with potent force, and *le Ventre de Paris*, on the Central Markets, incarnates the materialism of physical sustenance, just as Hugo's *Notre-Dame de Paris* is the emblem of mediæval mysticism.

Guy de Maupassant (1850–1893), the protégé of Flaubert, the disciple of Flaubert and Zola, is next to the author of *Madame Bovary* the greatest of the school. Gifted with great physical strength, but having the potential germs of inherited mental disease, he ruined his health by overwork, and sensuality, and drugs like opium, haschisch, and cocaine, until madness and the strait waistcoat ended in general paralysis. Much of his work deals with his native Normandy and its peasants whose vices he knew far better than he did their virtues. His literary career began with the short story *Boule de Suif*, a reminiscence of the Franco-Prussian war, contributed to Zola's *Soirées de Médan*, and he became a master of the *nouvelle*, in which often the *esprit gaulois* of the old *fabliaux* reappeared in more artistic form. Nevertheless, Maupassant was not, like Flaubert, a slave of style, so that he is one of the most impersonal of all the great Naturalists, and his productivity was very great during the eleven years (1880–1891) which mark his literary fame. Yet the collections of tales called *la Maison Tellier*, *Mademoiselle Fifi*, and *les Contes de la bécasse*, which often seem to have as main object to scandalise the conventional, are almost equalled by such novels as *Une vie*, *Bel-Ami*, *Mont-Oriol*, *Fort comme la mort*, and *Notre cœur*. *Pierre et Jean*, written later, has a touch of feeling unknown to the earlier novels. They are for the most part gloomy and brutal, are full of the obsession of sex, and as reeking with smells as the works of Zola. But such a work as *Bel-Ami*

is as vivid a picture of Paris as *Madame Bovary* is of provincial life. Georges Duroy or "Bel-Ami" is the nineteenth-century *picaro* or *paysan parvenu*, selfish and heartless and, like Dumas's Monsieur Alphonse, making his way with the help of women. *Une vie* is the story of a woman deceived by all in whom she has centred love and trust.

The gruesomeness of Poe is surpassed by the greater realism of the short stories written as Maupassant half realised the coming of the madness which killed him: *Lui?*, *le Horla*, and *Qui sait?* They describe different forms of hallucination: the first, the terror of the externalisation of self seen as another being, what one of his biographers calls by the psychological term of "autoscopy," of which, it may be added, we get a rudimentary form in Musset's "étranger vêtu de noir qui me ressemblait comme un frère" (*la Nuit de décembre*); the second, the diary of a man going insane and persecuted by the dread of a supernatural and mysterious personality merging itself into his own; the third, a portrayal of the hallucinatory fear which accompanies insanity, and which, under one form or another, was ever present to Maupassant.

Maupassant is unsurpassed as an artist among modern French writers of fiction, but his art was to profess to have none and to record, without philosophical comment or æsthetic arrangement, the events of sordid lives. His greatness lies in the impression he produces of absolute truthfulness, the best test of realism.

Alphonse Daudet (1840–1897) was a Realist, also, but one of a different character, in whose works there entered a strain of sentiment akin to the procedure of the English Realists, and he was often, but not to his liking, compared to Dickens. His characters, like those of Dickens, have their Homeric epithets or idiosyncrasies which are taken as their key-note. They stand out, again, like those of Dickens, as types which can be used to describe persons in real life. Moreover, Daudet had the humorous touch of Dickens and wrote his comic masterpieces

on Tartarin, which rank with the adventures of Mr. Pickwick and his friends, as he wrote his *David Copperfield* in *le Petit Chose*. He is the great chronicler of those who have failed in life.

Daudet was a southerner, born at Nîmes, and ground down in early youth by hard poverty, which he describes in *le Petit Chose* and in the autobiographical *Trente ans de Paris*. He began his money-earning career as a *pion* (usher) in a school. Coming to Paris at eighteen to make his way in literature, he was more than once near starvation. But the duc de Morny, brother of Napoleon III, took an interest in him and thereafter his path was smooth. Daudet's first volume was a collection of poems, *les Amoureuses*, but he turned to fiction, writing either charming short stories such as the *Lettres de mon moulin* and the *Contes du lundi*, dramas like *l'Arlésienne*, or novels such as *le Petit Chose*, the *Tartarin* series, *Froment jeune et Risler aîné*, *Jack*, *le Nabab*, *les Rois en exil*, *Numa Roumestan*, *l'Evangéliste*, *Sapho*, *l'Immortel*. *Le Petit Chose* is the pathetic story of Daudet's own experiences as an undersized and persecuted school usher and of his early days in Paris; *Froment jeune et Risler aîné* contains the immortal character of Delobelle, the old actor living in a stage world of his creation, and of Sidonie Chèbe, the vain and empty-headed Parisian girl; *Jack* is the story of the neglected son of an irresponsible mother and introduces us in the gymnase Moronval to a sort of Dotheboys Hall; *Les Rois en exil* and *le Nabab* are pictures of Paris the resort of dethroned kings and of naïf millionaires. In *Numa Roumestan* is shown the loquacious southerner: it is a satire of Gambetta, just as in *le Nabab* the duc de Morny appears. *L'Evangéliste* is a study of religious fanaticism; *Sapho* is the usual painful story of the consequences of illicit *liaisons;* and *l'Immortel* satirises the Academy which Daudet never succeeded in entering.

In the *Aventures prodigieuses de Tartarin de Tarascon* and in *Tartarin sur les Alpes* Daudet writes the satirical prose epic of his fellow-southerners, boastful, wildly untruthful, but con-

vinced of the sincerity of their own imagination and bubbling over with animation and language. These two books alone place Daudet in the first rank of humorists; *Port-Tarascon* is inferior. Very different is the impression produced by *l'Arlésienne*, the play over which hovers the figure, never actually seen, of the wicked woman of Arles who breaks up the happiness of a family and causes the suicide of the luckless boy who loves her. Then there is pathos in stories like *le Siège de Berlin* or *la Dernière classe*, and unbridled mirth in the sermon of *le Curé de Cucugnan*.

Thus Daudet is a Realist, but not an impersonal one. He makes abundant use of the note-book, as they all do, but the human touch is not absent from his synthesis. He has neither the cold-bloodedness of Maupassant, nor the brutality of Zola, nor the incoherence of the Goncourts.

Ferdinand Fabre (1830–1898) is little read as compared with the other writers of the Realistic school, yet he is one of the noteworthy authors of his generation. His stories deal largely with life in the comparatively unvisited Cévennes country, and his plots centre about the intrigues of priests, in describing whom he is unequalled except by Balzac in *le Curé de Tours*. *L'Abbé Tigrane* is a marvellous character study of ambition, and *Mon Oncle Célestin* has the truth of personal experience. Other clerical novels by Ferdinand Fabre are *les Courbezon*, *Lucifer*. *Le Chevrier* and *Xavière* are rustic idyls.

Realism did not draw to itself all the men of letters of the second half of the nineteenth century, though the other writers are far less united in theory and purpose. Victor Hugo continued his production of Romantic fiction, and *les Misérables* with the succeeding novels belong to this period. The artist Eugène Fromentin (1820–1876) author of *Un été dans le Sahara*, wrote also *Dominique*, a novel of sentimental analysis and psychological experience in autobiographical form, in which the feeling of Rousseau is staged in the painter's setting.

The most prominent of the "idealistic" or sentimental writers

was Octave Feuillet (1821–1891), the novelist of high life during the second Empire and the favorite of Napoleon III and of Eugénie. He composed works of all sorts: early Romantic plays in collaboration, proverbs, which made one of the Goncourts call him the "Musset des familles" (a pun on the name of the periodical *le Musée des familles*), comedies, and novels. The perpetual subject of his writings is love, which is set forth with all the refinement of Mlle de Scudéry's novels or of eighteenth-century *marivaudage*. He is a city novelist of fashion and of good manners, and nature plays with him a minor part. His language is reserved, his characters are apparently refined, his morals "proper," and he was the favorite author of sentimental women of his time and a pillar of the respectable *Revue des Deux-Mondes*. But his plots sometimes had an insidious charm, and his pictures of charming but perverse hothouse heroines of a drawing-room Romanticism were scarcely inspiring models for the frivolous women of his day.

Feuillet's most famous novel, the *Roman d'un jeune homme pauvre*, is, however, of a different kind and portrays the impoverished but proud nobleman obliged to earn his living, the haughty maiden whom he loves, the wicked and jealous one who loves him, all placed in a setting of romantic Breton scenery, with lonely towers and gloomy woods. But *Monsieur de Camors* portrays the nineteenth-century Don Juan, and M. de Chevrial in the play *Un roman parisien* is the picture of the *viveur*. Other novels are *Julie de Trécœur*, *Un mariage dans le monde*, *les Amours de Philippe*, *la Morte*, and *Honneur d'artiste*.

Victor Cherbuliez (1829–1899), of Swiss origin, began by an artistic and archæological fantasy, *Un cheval de Phidias*. His chief novels, *le Comte Kostia*, *Méta Holdenis*, *Miss Rovel*, *l'Idée de Jean Têterol* are clever, well constructed, and well written, and have about every quality but conviction. He was more successful as a willing philosophical observer and dialectician.

Edmond About (1828–1885), a brilliant journalist, critic, and

novelist, had something of Voltaire's wit, though he did not show it in all his novels. *Le Roi des montagnes* is a most amusing satirical story of adventure in Greece, and the stories forming the *Mariages de Paris* and the *Mariages de province* are graceful. His other best known works, *Tolla*, *l'Homme à l'oreille cassée*, *le Nez d'un notaire*, *le Roman d'un brave homme*, vary in quality and interest.

Emile Erckmann (1822–1899) and Alexandre Chatrian (1826–1890), who collaborated under the name Erckmann-Chatrian, wrote stories of their native Alsace during the great Revolution, the first Empire, or the Franco-Prussian war in a fantastic, sentimental, or idyllic tone, and attacked war and military display. Their most famous novel is *l'Ami Fritz*, but their plays, *le Juif polonais*, known in English as *The Bells*, and *les Rantzau*, had tremendous success.

Ludovic Halévy (1834–1908) evidently tried to atone for the levity of his collaborations with Henri Meilhac by his sentimental stories, *Un mariage d'amour* and *l'Abbé Constantin*. The series on the Cardinal family, *Monsieur et Madame Cardinal*, *les Petites Cardinal*, *la Famille Cardinal*, on the young ladies of the *corps de ballet* and their disreputable parents, take us back to gaiety and mirth.

A study of the nineteenth century would not be complete without consideration of the three eccentrics, Barbey d'Aurevilly, Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, and Huysmans. They are symptomatic of certain literary phases of their age which they set in clearer relief than more conventional figures do. Moreover, Barbey and Villiers were not without considerable influence, in attitude at least, upon the "décadents" of the *fin-de-siècle*.

Jules Barbey d'Aurevilly (1808–1889) was an impecunious bohemian, novelist, journalist, and critic, and the permanent embodiment of the actor on parade as well as the connecting link, across a generation, between the old Romantic egotists and the neo-Romantic individualists who, especially in poetry,

followed after the Parnassians. He posed as an intellectual aristocrat (legend had it that he was descended from Louis XV) and as a fashionable dandy, though his costume grew more grotesque and his manner more extraordinary. He expressed, at different periods, almost diametrically opposed views as he ranged from incredulity to mystical Catholicism, from liberalism through Bonapartism to monarchism. His voluminous criticisms have no value of interpretation, but are examples of brilliant irony and vituperation, showing by stinging epigrammatic phrases the failings of his victims. He prided himself on having his hand against every man, on being an iconoclast, an *éreinteur*, or as he called it, a "sagittaire." He was the mediæval paladin, the "constable of France of letters" fighting modern Philistinism.

In early life Barbey d'Aurevilly had known and sympathised with troubled spirits like his intimate friend Maurice de Guérin and the latter's sister Eugénie, and was held in check somewhat by his friend, the publisher Trébutien, of Caen. Later, under the influence of drugs and the growing megalomania of the Byronic rebel, he developed an attitude of "artistic" Romanticism, which we should call eccentric or decadent. His rigid mediæval Catholicism, after the order of Joseph de Maistre and Bonald, became a neurotic perversion of faith and a belief in Satanism, in the Devil as an active force set up against God, an attitude finding expression in symbolism, psychological and sentimental. All this may seem to verge on lunacy, yet Barbey d'Aurevilly found admirers and followers, not only in persons like Huysmans, but also among the coteries of the Symbolist poets and the adepts of the "advanced" reviews, such as the *Revue blanche*, *la Plume*, and *le Mercure de France*.

Barbey d'Aurevilly's writings spread over a wide field and include his miscellaneous literary, dramatic, and artistic criticisms, some poetry, confessions or memoranda of the Rousseau order ("vomitoria" of the soul), a study of dandyism and Beau Brummell. But his chief significance as an influence lies rather in his not very numerous works of fiction. They are steeped

in the atmosphere of his native Normandy, but particularly they exemplify the spirit of the perverse and an amoralism which at least once brought him in danger of prosecution. The chief ones are *l'Amour impossible*, *Une vieille maîtresse*, *l'Ensorcelée*, *le Chevalier des Touches*, *Un prêtre marié*, and *les Diaboliques*.

Auguste Villiers de l'Isle-Adam (1838–1889) was all his life a fantastic and mystical dabbler. A wonderful improviser, a brilliant talker like Barbey d'Aurevilly, he often became the dupe of his own whimsical imaginations. This impecunious bohemian in threadbare clothing boasted that he was descended from a grand master of the Knights of Malta, and on the strength of it wanted to be a candidate to the throne of Greece on the death of King Otto.

Villiers de l'Isle-Adam fell under the influence of occultism and mixed together in his admiration Poe, Hegel, and Wagner. He lived among the monks of the abbey of Solesmes and published *Isis*, a mixture of occultism and of the symbolism of religion that is also to be found in Barbey's *Prêtre marié*. His other chief works were *Elën*, *Morgane*, *l'Eve future*, and *Axël*. Much of his life was spent in poverty and obscurity, for Villiers de l'Isle-Adam belonged to the elect whom the philistine could not appreciate. None the less, his work occasionally verged on genius, and he is a significant figure in the last years of the nineteenth century. Though not an author of wide influence, he must not be neglected.

Joris-Karl Huysmans (1848–1907) illustrates the pathological degeneration of Naturalism beyond the brutality of Zola and the morbidness of the Goncourts into the hallucinations of an inverted existence. He was an extraordinary cross between Naturalism and decadent Romanticism. Beginning as a direct follower of Zola and a contributor to the *Soirées de Médan* of a description of diarrhœa (*Sac au dos*) and works such as *Marthe* and *les Sœurs Vatard* of similar distinction, he before long evolved to *A rebours*, the narrative of one Des Esseintes who experiments in every anti-natural sensation which he can devise.

From this book Oscar Wilde drew much for his *Picture of Dorian Gray*. Huysmans's love for filth merges into an ardor for every sterilising form of nervous corruption surrounded by an atmosphere of mysticism. He delights in describing out of the way jewels, remote shades of color, incongruously juxtaposed sensations. The progress toward the abnormal went on through his succeeding works, such as *Là-bas*, dabbling in the morbid Satanism of Barbey d'Aurevilly and the worship of the Devil, until at last Huysmans or his hero Durtal went from the æsthetic mysticism to a sort of Christian mysticism or Catholic sacerdotalism (*En route*, *la Cathédrale*, *Sainte-Lydwine de Schiedam*, *l'Oblat*), in which the drama and ritualism of religion were uppermost. He experimented in the life of the Trappists, withdrew for a time to the Benedictine monastery of Ligugé near Poitiers, where centuries before the robust and healthy Rabelais had stayed. Rabelais and Huysmans, what a contrast!

Huysmans is the dyspeptic, brooding over physical discomforts and transmuting a mysticism of the stomach or intestines into physiological language: the dysentery of *Sac au dos* is replaced by the "dysenteric soul." He can think of no function of the body or soul as healthy, nor is there one gleam of cheer in his writings.

The miscellaneous minor writers of the later nineteenth century are numerous:

Arsène Houssaye (1815–1896), a fluent polygraph, began as a bohemian Romanticist with Gautier and Nerval, produced all his life miscellaneous novels and pastel-criticisms, contributed much to journalism, and during the second Empire was for some time director of the Théâtre-Français and thus influential in the dramatic world.

Henry Gréville (Mme Alice Durand) (1842–1902), the daughter of Jean Fleury, a French professor established in Russia, spent many years of her life there and was a prolific author of eminently proper novels of life in Russia and in France. Her most famous story is *Dosia*, of which the heroine is a Russian;

Frankley may interest Americans as the result of a visit to the United States.

Léon Cladel (1835–1892) combined in his stories of southern France the brutality of the Realists with the search for form of the Parnassians. His novels are vigorous, but labored in expression through mannerisms and contortions of style in which Baudelaire's influence can be seen.

Emile Pouvillon (1840–1906), also a novelist of life in southern France, described in short stories or in novels like *Césette, les Antibel,* and *Jep* the country more poetically than Cladel did. André Theuriet (1833–1907) was the romancer of life in the country and in small towns of eastern France, such as the Ardennes.

Louis Ulbach (1822–1889) wrote a large number of stories, indistinguishable though not without interest. Louis Enault (1824–1900) was, again, a meritorious writer of the second class, whose unimpeachable stories made Zola call him "la pommade de l'idéal, le sirop du romanesque." Hector Malot (b. 1830) is known chiefly by *Sans Famille.*

It seems hardly fair to neglect two story-tellers who have given great delight to the young: Mme de Ségur and Jules Verne. La comtesse de Ségur, *née* Rostopschine (1799–1874), wrote many tales, such as *Un bon petit diable* for Hachette's *Bibliothèque rose illustrée,* a children's series which took its name from the famous eighteenth-century modernisations of ancient fiction in the *Bibliothèque bleue* of the comte de Tressan. Jules Verne (1828–1906), the author of "extraordinary voyages" to the moon, the centre of the earth, in a balloon, under the seas, around the world, on a comet, and elsewhere, has delighted hundreds of thousands of boys of all countries. His scientific veneer is termed misleading, his style is the negation of style, but his imagination anticipated more than one great discovery and he did his humble task well.

CHAPTER XIV

THE DRAMA

DURING the second half of the nineteenth century the tendency toward Realism is obvious in the drama as in fiction, and about 1880 many writers swing to Naturalism. During the second Empire the most successful authors were Augier, Dumas *fils*, Feuillet, Sardou, Labiche, and Meilhac and Halévy. They represent different phases of the new Parisian civilisation and satirise, either angrily or good-humoredly, the weaknesses and vices of that carnival time. They are inclined to pose as the moralist and preacher, for the new drama purports to *castigare mores*. They theorise on problems or theses as much as a Diderot did and with such skill in dramatic technique as often to conceal the hollowness of the plot or the fallacy of the argument. For this skill they were in no small degree indebted to the much abused Scribe.

Emile Augier (1820–1889), along with the younger Dumas and Labiche the best dramatic portrait-painter of his times, began by adhering to the short-lived school of Ponsard, and it was he who more particularly gave it the turn to the "lyrisme du pot-au-feu." Nor was he without touches of expiring Romanticism. He was still groping his way and had not yet found his dramatic formula which was to express in prose the better middle-class virtues. Augier saw the weaknesses of the *bourgeoisie*, but he was always at heart, in the best sense of the term, a *bourgeois*.

Augier was not in the slightest degree a poet, although his earliest plays are in verse, beginning with *la Ciguë* in 1844. The scene was laid in antiquity as was that of *le Joueur de flûte* a

few years later. During a decade Augier continued to write in verse, but with *le Gendre de Monsieur Poirier* he gave it up except for two later plays, *la Jeunesse* and *Paul Forestier*. The most significant of the early period were *l'Aventurière*, an indirect attack upon the Romantic heroine, of which the scene was laid in the Italian Renaissance; *Gabrielle*, a protest against the breaking up of family life through adultery excused by sentiment. It showed the discovery by the woman who deemed herself "incomprise" that the husband was nobler than the seducer, and won for Augier from the Academy a prize for its lesson in virtue. *Philiberte* is full of pretty eighteenth-century prattling, but the setting is an accessory.

Le Gendre de Monsieur Poirier, written in collaboration with Jules Sandeau and usually considered the greatest modern French comedy of character and of manners, represents the contrast between the impecunious aristocrat married to the daughter of a rich *bourgeois* of the reign of Louis-Philippe and his vain and pushing father-in-law. Neither person is a caricature and the play does not end with the triumph of either side; therein lies an important explanation of the truthfulness of Augier's Realism.

Augier, having gained self-confidence, became more outspoken and his critics complained of his immodesty in the choice of subjects. Thus *le Mariage d'Olympe* is a picture of the courtesan made respectable by marriage, but in spirit falling back to her degradation through the "nostalgie de la boue" and punished by a pistol shot. It is a retort to the Romantic rehabilitation of the lost woman and a rejoinder to plays like *la Dame aux camélias*. *Les Lionnes pauvres* created above all a scandal by its picture of a married woman yielding, through vanity, love of finery, and need of money, to adultery.

The later comedies of Emile Augier belong to the category known as *la comédie sociale*, in which the study may still be of types, but rather as the results of general social vices which the play attacks. The new development did not even prevent the

identification of personal characters, inasmuch as Louis Veuillot was pilloried in the Déodat of *le Fils de Giboyer* and suggestions of Guizot and Mme Swetchine were asserted. In *les Effrontés* Augier showed the shameless scramble for wealth, in *le Fils de Giboyer* clerical meddling in politics. *Maître Guérin*, which has elements again of the comedy of manners, portrays the crooked country lawyer. In *la Corruption* Augier attacks the spirit of general irreverence, of what we have alluded to more than once as *la blague; Lions et renards* renews the anti-clerical campaign. After the war came *Jean de Thommeray*, a patriotic play. Finally, *Madame Caverlet* is a plea in favor of divorce and *les Fourchambault* is on the natural child.

Thus Emile Augier tried to show his fellow-citizens the dangers to which they were liable from financial trickery and loss of moral convictions and ideals. He did so in some of the best constructed plays of the nineteenth century, which present many of its most noteworthy literary types: Poirier, Vernouillet, Guérin, and Giboyer, the bohemian journalist, or d'Estrigaud, the new Don Juan. Augier is the one to whom of all their modern dramatists the French are most ready to attribute the good sense of Molière.

Alexandre Dumas the younger (1824–1895) began to write plays after Augier did, but he found his footing more rapidly and influenced not only the whole French drama, but in some cases his vigorous and independent fellow-author. He is the chief creator of the modern comedy of manners. He is also the great example of that constant phenomenon in recent French drama, the moralist who shocks everybody. Sarcey criticised Dumas as speaking "sur la scène de choses qui, dans l'ordre moral, font sur l'imagination un effet . . . médicinal." Such was, evidently, Dumas's theory of the purgation of the passions.

Dumas the younger, as his father's son, began by poetry and Romantic fiction, but before long he turned to contemporary Realism. His novel, *la Dame aux camélias*, was on the hackneyed subject of the rehabilitated courtesan, but she now appeared in

a modern setting and was drawn from actual life. When a few years later, in 1852, before Augier's *Gendre de Monsieur Poirier*, he dramatised the subject, he gave the first important example of the new Realistic comedy, and Paris was to him, as to the pseudo-scientists of fiction, the "grand creuset où il semble que Dieu fait ses expériences." (Preface of *la Femme de Claude*.) With *Diane de Lys* and *le Demi-Monde* Dumas's success was firmly established. The latter, the result, like so many of his comedies, of experience, portrayed the woman adventuress on the outskirts of society who tries to win position and reputation. *La Question d'argent* shows the corrupting influence of money. There followed *le Fils naturel*, *Un père prodigue*, *l'Ami des femmes*.

Dumas's plays were now undergoing a transformation. Instead of being pictures of character or manners alone, they became didactic and deserve the name now so familiar of "problem plays" or "pièces à thèse," what Dumas called the "théâtre utile." *Les Idées de Madame Aubray*, in 1867, is the first marked example of this tendency and preaches by example forgiveness to the woman who has sinned. *La Princesse Georges* discusses pardon by the wronged wife, and *la Femme de Claude* the man's right to kill the woman. In a pamphlet, *l'Homme-Femme*, published just before the latter play, Dumas inveighed against the faithless female and uttered the cry, "Tue-la."

Monsieur Alphonse pictures the rascal trying to make his way in the world by means of women, neglecting the one whom he has wronged in order to get another's money. *L'Etrangère* carries one out of reality into a world of over-men and monstrous over-women. Dumas is here, as to a certain degree in *la Femme de Claude* and *la Princesse de Bagdad*, the victim of his own exaggerated theories. The last important plays, *Denise* and *Francillon*, become more natural.

Dumas wrote various plays in collaboration, the most famous of which are *les Danicheff* and the revision of the *Marquis de Villemer*, besides a quantity of miscellaneous prefaces and

pamphlets in which he set forth his theories. His novel *l'Affaire Clémenceau* acquired new fame when dramatised much later.

Dumas's theories were asserted in preface or play with alternately the frenzy of a Père Duchesne and the *persiflage* of a *boulevardier* of the second Empire. Dumas is as rich in allusions to Holy Writ as a negro revivalist, and at times this biblical octoroon rages against the faithless woman as the she-ape with whom Cain must have mated in the Land of Nod ("la guenon du pays de Nod") and justifies her murder, at times the *blagueur* of his comedy discourses on the *demi-mondaine* as a "pêche à quinze sous," apparently good, but at heart slightly tainted and therefore sold cheaper by the greengrocer than the sound "pêche à vingt sous." The parabasis of the old Greek comedy, which in Molière was represented by the *raisonneur*, is in Dumas furnished by the society ironist and modern Gallio who sometimes gets on one's nerves. Dumas is also fond of the veneer of science which has been fashionable in many writers since the advent of the post-Romantic days. He defines love, in the preface of *Une visite de noces*, by the physiological dictionary and in *l'Etrangère* analyses the corrupt and dissolute man as a "vibrion."

In spite of Dumas's preaching and moralising upon adultery in a language compounded from physiological terms and the Apocalypse, he is not thinking of the woman so much as of the man, who represents to him intelligence and superiority in the warfare of the sexes. "Les femmes ne se rendent jamais au raisonnement, pas même à la preuve; elles ne se rendent qu'au sentiment ou à la force." (*L'Homme-Femme.*) Dumas's eternal subject of adultery follows the line of filiation from his father's *Antony*. George Sand had acclimated it in a poetical form in fiction in the "femme incomprise," Dumas *fils* made the "éternelle Messaline" no less familiar from the man's standpoint. From them the modern drama and fiction have copied again and again, until we have returned to the conditions of the mediæval farces and *fabliaux*, and, as M. Faguet says, the husband,

the wife, and the lover have become "les trois unités modern style."

Meanwhile Feuillet, in the plays dramatised from his novels, was showing a conventional and proper society in which the sentimental protagonists were scarcely more moral at heart than the courtesans or *déclassées* of Dumas.

There has rarely been a more successful writer for the stage than Victorien Sardou (1831–1908) and no writer who has more consistently subordinated his talent to popular taste or to the needs of a favorite actress like Sarah Bernhardt. His fertility was equalled only by his versatility: he wrote vaudeville-comedies, vaudevilles, melodramas, comedies historical and satirical, plays tragical-comical-historical, scenes indivisible, and works unlimited. In every one he reaches the audience, either by prestidigitation of plot, in plays humorous as *les Pattes de mouche* or serious as *Dora*, by the satire social or political of *la Famille Benoîton* or *Rabagas* (a caricature of Gambetta), by the boisterous farce of *Divorçons*, by the frenzy of *la Tosca*, by the spectacular melodrama of *Théodora*. Other important plays by Sardou are *Nos intimes*, *les Vieux garçons*, *Nos bons villageois*, *Patrie*, *la Haine*, *l'Oncle Sam* (a satire on America), *Daniel Rochat*, *Fédora*, *Madame Sans-Gêne*, and *Thermidor*.

The greatest humorist of the nineteenth century was probably Eugène Labiche (1815–1888). Undisturbed by theories and desirous only of raising a laugh, he poured forth a long series of farces and vaudevilles, including a few real comedies of character and of manners. He did not consider his works literature, and it was only at the instigation of Augier that, late in life, he published a selection of his best plays. And yet *le Voyage de Monsieur Perrichon*, portraying the vanity of the *bourgeois*, is as good as Molière's *Bourgeois gentilhomme*. Labiche is an example of the *esprit gaulois*, but though sometimes broad to the English taste, he is without the indecency of the contemporary composers of Palais-Royal farces. Posterity can always turn to Labiche's plays for pictures, slightly exaggerated, of the

middle-class types of his time. His chief plays were: *Un chapeau de paille d'Italie*, *le Misanthrope et l'Auvergnat*, *l'Affaire de la rue de Lourcine*, *le Voyage de Monsieur Perrichon*, *les Petits Oiseaux*, *la Poudre aux yeux*, *Célimare le bien-aimé*, *la Cagnotte*.

While Labiche was writing farces Henri Meilhac (1832–1897) and Ludovic Halévy collaborated in the production, chiefly with Offenbach's music, of operettas and opera-bouffes, comedies interspersed with song, the quintessence of Parisian *blague*: *la Belle Hélène*, *la Grande Duchesse*, *la Vie parisienne*, *la Périchole*. They also wrote farces or vaudevilles such as *Tricoche et Cacolet*, *le roi Candaule*, *Toto chez Tata*, and *la Cigale*, an occasional genuine comedy, *la petite Marquise* or *Fanny Lear*, or a play with a touch of pathos, such as *Froufrou*, portraying a light-headed and inconsequential but not wicked little woman. They also dramatised Merimée's *Carmen* for Bizet. Meilhac and Halévy are eminently "Second Empire."

It did not take long for both Dumas and Augier to appear old-fashioned and artificial. They who had seemed Realists in their time were accused of continuing the Scribe tradition of the "pièce bien faite" and of laying stress on conventional climaxes, claptrap tirades, and repartees. Especially, Dumas's stock characters and inevitable theories were criticised in the name of a more radical realism and of a return to life, just as the Romanticists and the Realists themselves had done. The melodramatic Sardou, the darling of the mediocre-minded, was included in the reprobation, and the vehement defence by the *bourgeois* critic Sarcey of the technically correct play did not prevent a forward evolution.

The leader of the new tendency toward Naturalism, Henry Becque (1837–1899), was at first treated almost as a literary lunatic, and his plays did not have much popular success. His bitter experiences embittered his work. He wrote a handful of plays, of which only two, *les Corbeaux* (1882) and *la Parisienne* (1886), have survived, but they are among the most noteworthy of the contemporary drama because of the direction at which

they hint. An unfinished play, *les Polichinelles*, did not become publicly known until 1910. Becque's notion was to neglect plot and to place before the spectator a section of experience, a "tranche de vie," in all its incoherence. This was the direct antithesis of the "pièce bien faite." Becque, with his gloomy view of life, seeing no particle of goodness or cheerfulness, is the initiator of the "théâtre rosse," the wicked and cruel drama. *Les Corbeaux* portrays the vicious people who swoop down like birds of prey on a family left helpless by death, and *la Parisienne* shows the lover as much installed in the family as the husband, and the woman who cares nothing for her lover but merely deems it the natural thing to have one, to take a second when tired of the first, to relapse to the first when tired of the second. Becque's plays have a cynical humor which crops up unexpectedly (*παρὰ προσδοκίαν*) and is painful instead of diverting.

Becque's tendencies were developed still further and with emphasis on the comedian's art by André Antoine, who as a young and unconventional actor founded the Théâtre-Libre in 1887. It was an only semi-public undertaking, depending on subscribers and thus escaping the censor. Between its foundation and 1896 it had various ups and downs, its chief success being from 1888 to 1893. But it had great influence on the development of the whole French drama, and many of the present prominent writers began at the Théâtre-Libre. Antoine wished to innovate in everything and transformed the conventions of stage-setting and of declamation, thereby doing a service to the stage and freeing it from the routine of Conservatoire methods. On the other hand, he carried to exaggeration the theory of the "tranche de vie" and, under pretext that the drama should portray all of life, he welcomed plays so salacious as to horrify many of those who could stand Naturalism in fiction. The dramatisation of the Goncourt's *la Fille Elisa* brought about interpellations at the Chamber of Deputies.[1] There came

[1] The Théâtre-Libre had a good effect in destroying artificial stage conventions in acting. It had a bad effect: firstly, in dislocating the drama

before long a reaction of weariness on the part of the public, and the Théâtre-Libre disappeared.. Antoine had not banished the fantastic play or verse drama and had even hospitably ventured into Symbolism and the exotic theatre of Scandinavia and Russia. But the *genre rosse*, spreading to other theatres, sufficiently disheartened seekers after amusement to make them welcome all the more enthusiastically the idealistic *Cyrano de Bergerac* when it was played in 1897.

It should not be supposed, indeed, that the poetical, fantastic, or idealistic drama had been entirely non-existent during the days of Realism and Naturalism. The early romantic intoxication of *Tragaldabas* by Hugo's follower Auguste Vacquerie (1819–1895) was ruined by its own exaggeration as well as by the inopportunity of its appearance in 1848. He was more successful with his adaptation, with Paul Meurice, of *Antigone* and with trifles like *Souvent homme varie*. Paul Meurice (1820–1905), another disciple of Hugo, adapted and dramatised plays,

under pretext of presenting a "tranche de vie"; secondly, in breaking down the reserve which had hitherto kept the horrible and indecent from the public stage. To the Théâtre-Libre we can attribute the indirect cause of eccentric theatres like the Grand-Guignol, with its performances of one-act plays of alternate mirth and madness, and plays such as those which make up André de Lorde's *Théâtre d'épouvante*, outdoing Poe's *Black Cat* or *Monsieur Valdemar*. The Théâtre-Libre led the way to the public performances of fæcal plays, like the *Ubu roi* of Alfred Jarry in 1896, few in number but with a worse effect: "*Ubu* est un des béliers qui renversèrent cette digue; maintenant elle est rompue; l'eau fangeuse coule à pleins bords; les obscénités de nos bas vaudevilles, de nos revues, toute cette saleté librement épanouie, je crois bien que tout cela date d'*Ubu*. . . . Alfred Jarry fut à ce point de vue un novateur. Son œuvre a révolutionné les mœurs du théâtre en y introduisant la plus basse licence. Il faut donc lui reconnaître une petite importance historique; elle n'en saurait avoir d'autre, car ce n'est, répétons-le, qu'une charge d'atelier uniquement destinée à faire hurler le bourgeois. Elle déposera dans la mémoire des hommes une date et un nom; on ne la jouera, ni ne la lira; mais on se rappelera *Ubu* le père en voyant les innombrables petits *Ubus* nés de lui." — A. Brisson, *le Théâtre*, troisième série.

such as *Hamlet* with Dumas, and wrote by himself *Fanfan la Tulipe* and *Struensée*. Théodore de Banville, the tight-rope rhymer,, wrote a number of plays, of which the brief *Gringoire* in prose, on the ugly poet who wins a fair girl's love, alone remains famous. By Louis Bouilhet the *Conjuration d'Amboise* was the most successful. François Coppée captivated the sentimental by poetic trifles such as *le Passant*, in which Sarah Bernhardt first won fame as an actress, and *le Luthier de Crémone*, the emotional and religious by *le Pater*, and the patriotic by *Severo Torelli* or *Pour la Couronne*, dramas of conspiracy, treachery, and retribution.

Henri de Bornier (1825–1901) will be long remembered, though by one only of his plays. *Les Noces d'Attila*, *le Fils de l'Arétin*, and *France d'abord* have merits, but yield to *la Fille de Roland*. This drama is a compound of the spirit of Corneille and of Hugo, a cross between early Classicism and Romanticism: the heroism of Corneille, the picturesqueness of Hugo, with less lyrical beauty, with truer psychology. As a dignified and patriotic play, permeated with true poetic feeling, even though the verse be occasionally prosaic, it should always deserve high esteem.

Among the miscellaneous writers of the period the long-lived Ernest Legouvé (1807–1903) shared some of Scribe's successes, such as *Adrienne Lecouvreur* and *Bataille de dames*. Théodore Barrière (1823–1877) dramatised Murger's *Vie de bohême*, portrayed in *les Faux bonshommes* types of *bourgeois* selfishness and hypocrisy, and in *les Filles de marbre* produced the character of Desgenais the *raisonneur* who practically gave his name ("un desgenais") to that type in modern comedy such as we find him in Dumas. The great success of Adolphe Belot (1829–1890) was *le Testament de César Girodot*. Edmond Gondinet (1829–1888) wrote many farces in the strain of Labiche. Jules Moinaux (1815–1895) gave vaudevilles and farces, especially *les Deux sourds*. Alexandre Parodi (1840–1901), a Greek by birth, composed Classical tragedies in the Romantic spirit. Edouard

Pailleron (1838–1899) wrote, besides a trifling bit of *marivaudage* called *l'Etincelle*, one of the best comedies of manners of the nineteenth century, *le Monde où l'on s'ennuie*, a companion piece to the *Femmes savantes* as a satire of fashionable literary coteries and their fads.[1] The professor beloved by ladies is supposed to be a portrait of Caro, the philosopher and lecturer.

[1] See also Saint-Evremond's *les Académistes* and Palissot's *les Philosophes*.

CHAPTER XV

POETRY

DURING the third quarter of the nineteenth century poetry undergoes the same experience as prose and becomes less Romantic or, at any rate, assumes that form of neo-Romanticism expressed by the study of art for art's sake. It was not to be expected that Victor Hugo should change his attitude, nor did he, but in nearly all other writers the subjective strain became for a time less marked except in some of the women sentimentalists. Mme Louise Colet (1810–1876), the friend of Cousin and Flaubert, was a poetess of the school of Lamartine. Mme Blanchecotte (1830–1897), also of the school of Lamartine, wrote of withered illusions and disappointed hopes. Louisa Sieffert (1845–1877), again, was the poetess of lost happiness and *Rayons perdus*. On the other hand, even a militant Romanticist such as Théophile Gautier was becoming more objective in *Emaux et Camées*. Louis Bouilhet (1822–1869), a friend of Flaubert, was the author of sundry plays, mostly in verse, such as *Melænis*, a Roman tale, and *Festons et Astragales*. Of these the latter, though the title is borrowed from Boileau, reminds one of such a heading as *Emaux et Camées* and shows, in a minor key, some of the transitional tendencies: exotic scenes and cult of objective form. The most significant writers of the new objective poetry and the models of the younger generation were Gautier, Théodore de Banville, Baudelaire, and Leconte de Lisle.

The theory of art for art's sake was partly the result of reaction against the industrialism of life becoming more accentuated as the century progressed and against the belief that art should be made useful and subordinate to other aims. The poets were

successors to the Romanticists and can be called neo-Romanticists in so far as they had the same attitude of aristocratic superiority to the common herd of mortals, of unwillingness to consider their work practical, of Romantic pessimism, and of fondness for local coloring. But the heart-nudity of Lamartine or Musset and their followers now palled and was replaced by an objective treatment, even though no less the result of experience. On the other hand, the pursuit of art, which meant labor instead of an unbridled inspiration, resulted in some cases in exaggeration and became a disease of thought, just as seventeenth-century preciosity had been a disease resulting from the cultivation of language for language's sake. Leconte de Lisle preserved harmonious reserve, but in artificial writers like Baudelaire it became the direct quest of the unnatural and complicated sensation, in familiar things of the decadent instead of the healthy, in remote or exotic things of the extraordinary instead of the natural. Thus the artist is interested in the neurotic person or *névrosé* instead of the no less melancholy *poitrinaire*, and Gautier talks about "le goût des femmes jaunes, vertes," while Baudelaire has to admire a negress because normal people prefer white women.

Théodore de Banville (1823–1891), a "cuisinier poétique" as a critic called him, was the author of the *Cariatides*, the *Stalactites*, and the *Odes funambulesques*, poetry in which the Romanticist's fondness for rhyme has become the writer's chief cult, so that he is always endeavoring to surmount some obstacle of verse, and the effect is often that produced by an acrobat who has just performed a difficult task. By queer "overflows," or out of the way rhymes, or throwing the rhymed stress on unimportant conjunctions (as "Dostoiewski" rhyming with "ce n'est pas nous qui") Banville delights in experiments in verse forms almost as complicated as the feats of the fifteenth-century *rhétoriqueurs*. His following, not inconsiderable even now, is chiefly among certain neo-précieux and dramatic poets. Yet he had another side sometimes overlooked, and the swinging

metre of Banville's verse occasionally recalls the anacreontics of Ronsard and of the Pléiade.

Charles Baudelaire (1821–1867) introduced into French literature the important influence of Poe whom he translated, but is chiefly known for the *Fleurs du mal* which, continuing the morbid Romanticism of Sainte-Beuve's *Joseph Delorme* combined with solicitude for form, was responsible for the vogue of the *genre macabre* and the cult of the "horrible" that minor "bold and bad" poets have since imitated in their pessimism. Victor Hugo wrote to Baudelaire that he had endowed French literature with a "frisson nouveau," and this thrill or shudder consisted in gloating, in highly wrought and elaborated language such as pleased Théophile Gautier, over death and decay, and in invoking complicated sensations of drugs, "spleen," corpses, vampires, bad smells, madness, despair. The grotesques and arabesques of Poe become hallucinations, yet Baudelaire's horrors lose much of their effect by seeming overdone and purposely written,

> Au milieu des flacons, des étoffes lamées
> Et des meubles voluptueux,
> Des marbres, des tableaux, des robes parfumées
> Qui traînent à plis somptueux,
>
> Dans une chambre tiède où, comme en une serre,
> L'air est dangereux et fatal,
> Où des bouquets mourants dans leurs cercueils de verre
> Exhalent leur soupir final.

Baudelaire was one of the first in France to praise Wagner's music, and he was among those who in poetry gave vogue to Symbolism. Alfred de Vigny employed symbols but did not leave a disciple. Baudelaire, on the other hand, at least prepared the way for the Symbolists and *décadents* who built their theory of poetry on the element of suggestion and the relations between things and the soul, precisely such as they professed to see in the music of Wagner.

Charles Leconte de Lisle (1818–1894), a native of the île Bourbon or île de la Réunion, a grand nephew of Parny, was the deity of those who reacted against the Romantic "exhibitionism," against the consumptive school of Lamartine or the absinthe school of Musset. His feeling is expressed in the lines of *les Montreurs:*

> Dans mon orgueil muet, dans ma tombe sans gloire,
> Dussé-je m'engloutir pour l'éternité noire,
>
> Je ne te vendrai pas mon ivresse ou mon mal.
> Je ne livrerai pas ma vie à tes huées,
> Je ne danserai pas sur ton tréteau banal
> Avec tes histrions et tes prostituées.

Leconte de Lisle was never a popular poet and he made but little effort to court favor, but he has always had a following among thinkers and was looked upon as a master by the Parnassians. A creole by birth, with some of the Celtic dreaminess of his Breton ancestry, he was ineffective in action, yet vigorous in thought. The straitened circumstances of a long period of his life may have inclined his thought to pessimism, but did not make his theories spasmodic, fitful, and yielding.

In youth Leconte de Lisle's sympathies were aroused by the sight of suffering slaves in his native island, and in France he was at first a follower of the humanitarian socialists, an admirer of Fourier, a believer in the harmonising principles of life such as are set forth in the *Sept cordes de la lyre* of George Sand, and he was by her writings initiated to a pantheistic mysticism, spiritual yet anti-religious so far as dogma is concerned.

Gradually, as Leconte de Lisle's reading became more extensive, he was influenced by Hindoo philosophy and Hellenic art. His Romantic-Germanic pantheism took the form of a Buddhist pessimism strengthened by the downfall of the liberalism of 1848 and the apparent social enervation which his whole life witnessed. Reacting against the present civilisation and the religion which has created it, Leconte de Lisle turned for refuge

to the beauty of Greece and the perfection of its art. He did not see in Hellenism the goal that can be reached, but an ideal that one may cling to as a consolation, even though one's yearning be overhung with the tragic consciousness of unfulfilment.

This pessimistic and anti-Christian attitude became impassiveness and impersonality. Individual feeling was veiled, so that at most the narrative or myth was an indirect symbolic interpretation of the poet's feeling. Leconte de Lisle's style is sculptural, with a touch of epic majesty, in which the chilliness of a learned epic is relieved by memories of exotic landscapes in the île Bourbon and by study of the poets of India or of Greece. An approach to pedantry is to be found in the habit of transliterating instead of translating classical names, as though Akhilleus were more appropriate than Achille, or Khirôn than Chiron. This tendency becomes a superfluous idiosyncrasy when Caïn is changed to Qaïn. Leconte de Lisle made prose translations, the literalness of which affected his style, of Homer, Hesiod, Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Theocritus, and Horace. His chief collections of poetry were the *Poèmes antiques*, *Poèmes barbares*, *Poèmes tragiques*. His play, *les Erinnyes*, was an adaptation from Æschylus.

Leconte de Lisle's fellow-native of the île de la Réunion, Auguste Lacaussade (1817–1897), the translator of Ossian and of Leopardi, the author of poems about the scenery of his native island, has been overshadowed by the fame of the greater creole poet.

It was Leconte de Lisle's friend Louis Ménard (1822–1901) who initiated him to Hellenism. Ménard was a brilliant and many-sided but ineffective person. He was versed in chemistry and discovered collodion, but got no credit because it was soon after independently discovered by an American with the similar name of Maynard; he dabbled in philosophy and reformed spelling and was an advanced socialist. Ménard's works comprise studies of Greek religion and philosophy, and moods including the *Rêveries d'un païen mystique*. In Hellenic civilisa-

tion he saw perfect brotherhood, and his own personal philosophy was a stoic calm. It is not exaggeration to say that the æsthetics of the Parnassian school go back ultimately to him, and he has not inaptly been termed the Boileau of the brief classical renaissance.

The Parnassians were a group of miscellaneous poets who reacted against the Romantic effusiveness. They had no common programme, but represented a tendency toward objectivity and equilibrium in art as opposed to subjective extremes. For this reason they were dubbed "les Impassibles" and called by the irreverent the "travailleurs de Lemerre," with a pun on the title of Hugo's novel, because their works were published by Alphonse Lemerre, or "les fô-ormistes," after Beaumarchais's Bridoison ("la fô-orme, toujours la fô-orme"). Like every literary school of the nineteenth century they were ambitious to rival the earlier Romanticists in notoriety and be a new set of Jeunes-France. They met at the home of the marquise de Ricard, mother of one of them, Louis-Xavier de Ricard (1843–1911), author of *Ciel, rue et foyer*, at that of the bohemian adventuress Nina de Callias, in Lemerre's bookshop, or at the Brasserie des Martyrs. The invention of the name Parnasse was claimed by Catulle Mendès in memory of the seventeenth-century collections of poetry such as the *Parnasse satirique*. Others attributed it to the philologist Charles Marty-Laveaux who edited the poets of the Pléiade for Lemerre.

Catulle Mendès as early as 1860, when scarcely eighteen, had tried to start a periodical called the *Revue fantaisiste*, to which Gautier, Banville, and Baudelaire, among others, contributed. A little later Mendès's friend Ricard was publishing a struggling weekly called *l'Art*, to advocate care and finish in literature, in opposition to the loose style of Lamartine and Musset on the one hand and the colorless language of Ronsard on the other. Mendès persuaded Ricard in 1866 to transform the unsuccessful periodical into a collection or volume of poems to be published in parts by Lemerre under the name of *Parnasse contemporain*.

The contributors were thirty-seven in number and included such writers as Gautier, Banville, Leconte de Lisle, Louis Ménard, Vacquerie, and Baudelaire.[1] The first *Parnasse* was followed by two other volumes in 1871 and 1876, but the first is the significant one.

The Parnassians always denied that they had necessarily anything else in common than "une formule," and their union was one of protestation against the bombast of Hugo, the whines of Lamartine, and the commonplaces of song-writers such as Béranger. They added that genius was no excuse for bad grammar. Thus the Parnassians were partisans of "l'art pour l'art," their works were intellectual rather than emotional, and their æsthetic theory approached sculpture or painting.

The drum-major of Parnassus was Catulle Mendès (1842–1909), a brilliant and erotic Jew from Bordeaux, Catulle son of a father named Tibulle. His early poems are not only clever imitations of the style of other poets, but often perfect in workmanship. Later he wrote, besides the *Légende du Parnasse contemporain*, miscellaneous criticism, and stories or novels whose very titles are meant to excite the senses. Toward the end of his life Mendès was largely occupied with the drama and in *Scarron* and *l'Impératrice* came under the influence of Rostand. *Glatigny*, a "drame funambulesque" (1906), was an attempt to immortalise his fellow-poet, the bohemian Albert Glatigny (1839–1873), a travelling actor and extraordinary improviser

[1] A list of the other contributors shows the membership of the original *Parnasse*: Heredia, François Coppée, Catulle Mendès, Léon Dierx, Sully Prudhomme, André Lemoyne, L.-X. de Ricard, Antony Deschamps, Paul Verlaine, Arsène Houssaye, Léon Valade, Stéphane Mallarmé, Henri Cazalis, Philoxène Boyer, Emmanuel des Essarts, Emile Deschamps, Albert Mérat, Henry Winter, Armand Renaud, Eugène Lefebure, Edmond Lepelletier, Auguste de Châtillon, Jules Forni, Charles Coran, Eugène Villemin, Robert Luzarche, Alexandre Piedagnel, Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, P. Fertiault, Francis Tesson, Alexis Martin. — Among the contributors to the second *Parnasse* were Louis Ratisbonne, Ed. Grenier, Anatole France, André Theuriet, Jean Aicard, Georges Lafenestre, Gabriel Vicaire, Albert Glatigny.

in the moods of Théodore de Banville. Mendès called him the "original Parnassian."

The most objective poet in the whole Parnassian group was José-Maria de Heredia (1842–1905). He wrote one volume of sonnets, not brought together in book form until 1893, *les Trophées*. Heredia, half Cuban, half French, and impeccable in manner and dress, so that his less conventional associates called him ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ κοσμοῦ ("the man of the world"), was no less impeccable in his sonnets. The poems range over the history of civilisation and are highly wrought medallions from the past. They are dazzling pictures, and the closing tercet, to which the whole sonnet is subordinated, suggests a wider vision which the poem opens up. Heredia is one of the masters of French sonnet literature.

Sully Prudhomme (1839–1907) began among the Parnassians, but, though he preserved the cult of plastic beauty, he became a philosophical poet. He is not, however, a mere rhyming metaphysician, and his verse ranges from the sentiment of *le Vase brisé* to the deeper tragedies of thought. Sully Prudhomme had undergone in youth an unhappy love experience, and the rest of his recluse life was saddened by it, though he viewed love later in a calm mood of idealisation and saw in it rather sacrifice than selfish passion. His intellectual masters were Lucretius, Marcus Aurelius, Alfred de Vigny, and Pascal, which means that he was an observer of the philosophy of cosmic science, a stoical pessimist face to face with the "espaces infinis" yet conscious of the strength of the "roseau pensant."

The austerity and remoteness of many of Sully Prudhomme's poems, no less than the rigidity of his prosody, prevent him from being a writer known to the many and veil the tenderness of his feeling. Unfortunately, some of his later writings do not keep a proper balance and are philosophy more than poetry. In 1902 he was awarded the Nobel prize. His chief writings are *Stances et poèmes*, *Solitudes*, *Vaines tendresses*, *la Justice*, *le Bonheur*, *Testament poétique*, and *la Vraie religion selon Pascal*.

François Coppée (1842–1908), whose name was Francis Coppée, came under the influence of the Parnassians through Catulle Mendès, but he very soon deviated from their "impassibility" and was the exponent of sentiment. His first play, *le Passant*, reacted against the Offenbachian *blague;* his little pictures in verse of the pleasures, and more particularly the sorrows, of life among the poor of Paris made people call him derisively a "lakiste de faubourg," as though he were an equivalent of the Lake School in city life, and portrayed the Idiot Boys, the Goody Blakes, and Reveries of poor Susan of the Paris working quarters. In this respect Coppée is a Realist; in the descriptive parts of his city elegies he preserves the training in prosody received from contact with the Parnassians, but he has the Romantic sentiment of sympathy for those who undergo the trials which his own youth had experienced. His merits are a vividness which makes his poems useful documents and a clever use of the pathetic or pseudo-pathetic rejoinder and conclusion. His chief collections of poetry were the *Reliquaire*, *les Intimités*, *les Poèmes modernes*, *les Humbles*, *les Récits et les élégies*, *Arrière saison*, *les Paroles sincères*, etc. Poems such as *la Grève des forgerons* and *la Bénédiction* contain a dramatic element which counterbalances the lachrymose tendency and makes them suited for declamation. Toward the end of his life François Coppée made an unfortunate incursion into politics in connection with the Dreyfus case. Eugène Manuel (1823–1901), who belonged to a slightly older generation than Coppée, was also a poet of sympathy and patriotism.

Henry Cazalis (1840–1909), who usually wrote under the name Jean Lahor, was a physician whose training led him to realise the insignificance of life, and whose interest in Eastern literatures, in Buddhism, and in Omar Khayyam made him the portrayer of majestic pessimism in the poems of *l'Illusion*, so that he is one of the most significant of the Parnassians. An earlier writer, Mme Ackermann (1813–1890), was no less a pessimist, but her pessimism had a little more vindictive-

ness, which some might call a touch of feminine spite against the cosmos.[1]

The inevitable reaction came against the Parnassians and the commonplace muse of Coppée. In the mid-eighties the cry arose among obstreperous innovators that poetry was either too impassive and objective or too philistine in its simplicity, while the Hugoesque Romanticism was played out. These innovators were apt to be of the long-haired eccentric type, and partly as a pose they reverted in the direction of Baudelairian morbidness and literary complication. The introduction written by Gautier for an edition of *les Fleurs du mal*, comparing Baudelaire's style to that of the decadence of the late Roman empire, seemed

[1] Among the minor Parnassians must be mentioned: Albert Mérat (1840–1909), a poet of Paris scenes, who committed suicide in old age from mere spiritual loneliness amid new literary generations; Léon Valade (1841–1883); Louis Ratisbonne (1827–1900), translator of Dante; Gabriel Vicaire (1848–1900), the poet of that district of France called la Bresse (*Emaux bressans*) and author in 1885, with Henri Beauclair, of the *Déliquescences d'Adoré Floupette*, a famous collection of parodies of the *décadents*, just as the *Parnassiculet contemporain* (1866) of Daudet, Paul Arène, and G. Mathieu had been a no less famous skit on the Parnassians. Other poets were Joseph Autran (1813–1877), author of poems of seafaring and rustic life; Joséphin Soulary (1815–1891), through his cult of form, especially in the sonnet, in many ways a precursor of the Parnassians; Amédée Pommier (1804–1877), who had almost as much verbal skill as Théodore de Banville though less renown, a poet of satire, parody, and burlesque, as in his *Enfer* directed against those who have reduced hell to a state of mind; Edouard Grenier (1819–1901); André Lemoyne (1822–1907), a poet of landscapes; Armand Silvestre (1837–1900) who, after composing charming poems as a young Parnassian and follower of Banville, became in after life a writer of indecent novels and short stories for the daily press; Paul Arène (1843–1896), a clever journalist and miscellaneous writer in prose and verse. We class as *chansonniers* Pierre Dupont (1821–1870), the bard of the farmer and ploughman, and Gustave Nadaud (1820–1893), author of *Je ne verrai jamais Carcassonne* and creator of the character Pandore in *les Deux gendarmes*, who ratifies all that his superior says:

"Brigadier, répondit Pandore,
Brigadier, vous avez raison."

appropriate to a period in which the expression "fin-de-siècle" was becoming common, as though the approaching end of the nineteenth century was to mark the close of a civilisation. People spoke, too, of Byzantinism in memory of the fall of Constantinople. So the *jeunes*, as they were called, dabbled in over-ripe poetry expressed in the contorted language characteristic of an over-civilised and hence moribund literature. They were too often poets of neurotic city life who knew little or nothing of true nature, who haunted the *cafés* and the *brasseries*.

For a short time the *décadents* were merely a party of protest, without any definite mark except the eccentricity which the Frenchman always assumes to scandalise the *bourgeois*. Soon the theory of Symbolism was devised and the *décadents* and Symbolists appeared as one party, though such was the individualism of these latter-day Romanticists that each man was really a law unto himself.

In general, Symbolism was a method of evocation or of double suggestion, somewhat akin to tendencies more familiar to English poetry, whether in the Lake School or the pre-Raphaelites, in which an object is thought of in terms of another linked with it by some bond of union which the poet descries. We have seen in France a logical Symbolism in Alfred de Vigny, and even Leconte de Lisle occasionally let a suggestion of personal feeling be shown in some poetic figure. But the Symbolists got their method chiefly from Baudelaire who used a great deal evocation and the *correspondances* of varied sensations, and through him they go back to Sainte-Beuve and the poems of *Joseph Delorme*, such as *les Rayons jaunes*.[1]

[1] Edmond de Goncourt says in his diary in 1889: "Les décadents, quoiqu'ils descendent un peu de mon style, se sont tournés contre moi." This refers partly to the "écriture artiste." Similarly, in a brief biographical sketch of Paul Adam we read: "Son premier ami de lettres fut Robert Caze, le romancier de *Fille à soldats* et de *Grand'mère*, qui peu d'années plus tard devait si malheureusement trouver la mort dans un duel survenu à la suite d'une polémique littéraire. Robert Caze était alors celui des

Symbolism differs from allegory, which had had such favor in France, in being infinitely more fluid. Where the allegory of the *Roman de la Rose* or of Mlle de Scudéry was a personification of qualities or a consistent parallelism, Symbolism vaguely hints at partial likenesses or is a composite of different suggestions or a string of mixed metaphors. Take, for instance, the symbolism of Albert Samain's graceful description of the soul:

> Mon âme est une infante en robe de parade
> Dont l'exil se reflète, éternel et royal,
> Aux grands miroirs déserts d'un vieil Escurial,
> Ainsi qu'une galère oubliée en la rade.
>
> Aux pieds de son fauteuil, allongés noblement,
> Deux lévriers d'Ecosse aux yeux mélancoliques
> Chassent, quand il lui plaît, les bêtes symboliques
> Dans la forêt du rêve et de l'enchantement.

The Symbolists, then, proposed to replace the objective descriptions of the Parnassians and to react against the materialism of the Realistic novelists by the reintroduction of ideas. But these ideas could be, and more properly were, indeterminate, and their effect, as opposed to the plastic art of the Parnassians, was that which music produces, or as Verlaine puts it in his *Art poétique:*

> Rien de plus cher que la chanson grise
> Ou l'Indécis au Précis se joint.

Hence the Symbolists always compared their art to music; they were usually ardent Wagnerites and maintained that poetry, like music, can suggest different thoughts or symbols to different people. Moreover, its meaning ought not to be clear on the

jeunes écrivains naturalistes sur qui l'on fondait le plus d'espoirs. Paul Adam rencontra chez lui une pléiade de poètes et d'artistes que la célébrité devait accueillir plus tard: Henri de Régnier, Jean Moréas, Francis Vielé-Griffin, Jean Ajalbert, J.-K. Huysmans, Camille et Lucien Pissarro, Raffaelli, Signac, etc. Ce fut du salon d'un romancier naturaliste, disciple préféré d'Edmond de Goncourt, que partit le mouvement littéraire qui allait devenir le symbolisme." — Marcel Batilliat, *Paul Adam.*

surface. The next step was an endeavor to do away in prosody with the regular beat of verse and to replace it by vague rhythm and by rhymes that were scarcely more than assonance. Thus all rules disappeared, the poem was reduced to the indeterminateness of melodious sound in a "psychic" instead of a syllabic verse, and for the first time writers in numbers used the irregular *vers libre*.[1] The school represented the undoing of French art and the last stage of late Romantic impressionism.

The Symbolists were not particularly numerous, though they were noisy and eager to establish reviews such as *la Plume* in which to air their theories. Some seriously thought that they were renovating the theory of poetry. Others probably saw the humorous side and rejoiced, as the heroic Romanticists of 1830 had done, in the chance for new *fumisteries* or practical jokes on the conventional. Adolphe Retté (b. 1863) saw what was comic in his own symbolism and expressed it in lines which might be the burlesque interpretation of the soul, where Samain's lines are serious. They show how much the material of Symbolism was a literary mosaic, influenced by nebulous Northern topics, such as strange princesses, mysterious forests, peacocks, swans, or the wonder-world of Grimm's fairy tales:

Mon âme est un vélin que hante
Tout un peuple bariolé:
Mélusine, Aude, Violante
Et Mab au rire constellé;
Puis encor — fantômes qu'enlève
Un Eros chevauchant un bouc —
Quelques Lilith, deux ou trois Eve:
I am a little copy-book.

[1] Poets, ignorant or neglectful of the spirit of French verse, tried all kinds of innovations: a Peruvian, Della Rocca de Vergalo, began to write poetry without capitals at the beginning of the lines; a Pole, Marie Krysinska, boasted of acclimatising the *vers libre*, though Jules Laforgue and Gustave Kahn are more rightly considered its initiators, and the American Stuart Merrill was more true to Walt Whitman than to Boileau.

Elfe blanc, toi nixe méchante,
Et toi kobold scandalisé
Par leur allure équivalente,
Et toi, promise à mon baiser,
Fleur où la lune a mis sa sève,
Enfant des djinns bleus, Lalla Rookh,
Illustrez un songe soève:
I am a little copy-book.

As time went on and the *jeunes* became middle-aged, their literary attitudes grew less rabid: the Symbolists generally got over their mistiness and became, on the whole, like other people, though their intellectual and metrical debauch left some traces in their poetry. By the new century the school had quite disintegrated.[1]

The deities of the *décadents* were Verlaine, Mallarmé, and to a minor degree, Villiers de l'Isle-Adam and Huysmans. The life of Paul Verlaine (1844–1896) was a tragedy: the alliterative parallel of Verlaine and Villon is constantly made, he compared himself to Poe, and a comparison with James Thomson, author of the *City of Dreadful Night*, springs to one's mind. Absinthe and evil passions made Verlaine sink from comfort to destitution, a quarrel with the poet Arthur Rimbaud,[2] who was the passion

[1] The Symbolists maintained, as usual, that their poetry implied a return to life. "C'est un retour à la nature et à la vie, très accentué, puisqu'il s'agit pour l'écrivain qui veut créer, de se consulter lui-même en sa propre intelligence, au lieu d'écrire d'après une tradition livresque, qui est le plus souvent, pour les débutants de toutes les époques, la tradition mise à la mode par les derniers succès." — Kahn, *Symbolistes et décadents*. They sometimes argued that their individualism was social or universal. Gustave Kahn, in the same book, puts it in the style of preciosity by saying that the poet "ne fait au fond que syllabiser son moi d'une façon assez profonde pour que ce moi devienne un soi, c'est à dire l'âme de tous."

[2] Arthur Rimbaud (1854–1891) was a wanderer like Verlaine, but destined to greater prosperity, since before his death he had become a colonial trader in Abyssinia. He made a fleeting passage through poetry, and his bizarre works cause him to be looked on as one of the precursors of the *décadents* and Symbolists. His most famous poem is the *Sonnet des voyelles*, attribut-

and nightmare of his life, caused his imprisonment in Belgium for eighteen months, and his last years were spent in oscillation between the *café* and the charity hospital. Yet Verlaine probably came nearer to genius than any other poet of his time. Totally lacking in equilibrium and self-control, he in turn wrote lewd poems and verses permeated with devotion. He began as a Parnassian, but gradually passed to subjective ironical or sentimental verses, of which the melancholy is expressed in a vague and half formless metre appealing above all to those who thought poetry needed dislocating. The influence of Baudelaire and the intimacy with Rimbaud led him to make poetry a sort of versified music, the lulling flow of which were to suggest the emotion. Without doubt his slothfulness encouraged these lapses from the orthodox labored prosody. Verlaine's chief works were the Parnassian *Poèmes saturniens*, the *Fêtes galantes*, the transitional poems *la Bonne chanson*, *Romances sans paroles*, *Sagesse*, *Jadis et naguère*. The poems of his last years, often erotic babblings, represent the decline of his genius. Verlaine is a pre-Symbolist.

Stéphane Mallarmé (1842–1898), professor of English in a Paris *lycée* and translator of Poe, was the object of apotheosis by the young Symbolists. He was pre-eminently the poet of the obscure and "abscons" and deliberately veiled his thought so successfully that his few verses are probably the most unintelligible ever written in French, even outstripping Maurice Scève and the *rhétoriqueurs* before that poet. Yet Mallarmé actually began as a Parnassian. His poetry reaches the indeterminateness of music and is but rhythmic sound. Mallarmé's best known work is *l'Après-midi d'un faune*.

ing colors to the different letters and illustrative of color audition. Verlaine gave posthumous fame to another poet, Tristan Corbière (1845–1875), author of the *Amours jaunes*, whom the new school professed to admire because of his inchoate verse, his melancholy life, and his consumptive's death. Charles Cros (1842–1888), author of monologues and of *le Coffret de santal* was also admired by the Symbolists for the strange quality of his small collection of verse.

One of the best and least freakish of the Symbolist poets was Albert Samain (1858–1900), though he died too soon to give his full measure. He tended to unite a Northern symbolism with Southern subjects and came closer than most of his fellows to the older art of Chénier. His chief works were *le Jardin de l'Infante*, *les Flancs du vase*, and *Polyphème*, a tragedy. Henri de Régnier began much in the same way, but he has outlived the Symbolist school.

The chief theorists of Symbolism were Gustave Kahn (b. 1859) who emphasised the *vers libre*; Charles Morice (b. 1861), whose *Littérature de tout à l'heure* heralds the poetry of "synthesis" in the form of abstraction, dream, and symbol; René Ghil (b. 1862), a follower of Mallarmé's eccentricities, who sets forth in his *Traité du verbe* an incoherent theory of verbal instrumentation, and with a great pretence of science purports to show the harmony of poetry and music. The poems of Ghil have often an astonishing look, with blank pages, or irregular lines beginning at random on the sheet with or without capitals.[1]

A small revolt from the Symbolists was led in the early nineties by Jean Moréas, followed by Raymond de la Tailhède, Maurice du Plessis, Hugues Rebell, Ernest Raynaud, and Charles Maurras. This was the so-called "Ecole romane française." Jean Moréas (1856–1910) was a Greek named Papadiamantopoulos, which name he exchanged for a geographical patronymic from the Peloponnesus or Morea as more amenable to French pronuncia-

[1] Among the minor Symbolists were Jules Laforgue (1860–1887), whose matter and manner may be summed up in his line: "Ah! que la vie est quotidienne!" or his laments on the "éternullité" of the world; Ephraïm Mikhaël (1866–1890); the Americans Stuart Merrill (b. 1863) and Francis Vielé-Griffin (b. 1864). Then there are the writers of the Belgian literary revival, led by Camille Lemonnier (b. 1845), and for the most part Symbolists: Emile Verhaeren (b. 1855), impressionist, interpreter of Ibsen and Wagner, called a spasmodic or "paroxystic" poet; Georges Rodenbach (1855–1898), poet and novelist of sleepy Flemish cities, such as "Bruges la morte"; Max Elskamp (b. 1862); André Fontainas (b. 1865); Albert Mockel (b. 1866). Maeterlinck belongs rather to the history of the drama.

tion. He entered at first fully into the Symbolist movement. Then he declared the necessity of returning to the Romanic tradition as against Northern mistiness and wrote verses in imitation of those of the Pléiade, reviving archaic terms in a very artificial manner. Finally, renouncing whimsical experiments, he showed himself a genuine poet by returning to the traditions of his fellow-Hellene Chénier and professed to rescue French verse from the aberrations which had followed the advent of Romanticism. His chief works were *le Pèlerin passionné*, *les Cantilènes*, *les Syrtes*, *les Stances*, and the play *Iphigénie*.

The "jeunes" contained enough freaks and mystifiers ("fumistes") to give an opportunity for mockers to enjoy themselves and to allow Max Nordau to accuse the whole movement of expressing a form of degeneration. The cultivation by some writers of naïf modes of expression or of popular ballad refrains and metres was called childish and half-witted, and the alliterative tendency, drawn from the English, of such a writer as Stuart Merrill seemed to recall, along with other devices, the excesses of the late fifteenth century. None the less, the Symbolist movement had, through its normal representatives, good effects: it opened certain possibilities for a prosody tending to become rigid and fossilised through the Parnassian cult of form or timidity in trying anything new. And by emphasising the sense of mystery it saved poetry from falling into a commonplace rehash of versified morals and metaphysics, or banal descriptions of life such as those of Coppée.

An interesting, though minor, manifestation of the late nineteenth-century poetry is what may be called the school of Montmartre, consisting chiefly of *chansonniers*.[1] Its membership

[1] It is an interesting evidence of the local flavor of Paris that the different quarters have had their characteristics. The individuality and fascination of the bohemian and artistic Montmartre is well known, as it is expressed, for instance, in Gustave Charpentier's opera *Louise*, and joins hands across the river with the student spirit of the Latin Quarter. Francisque Sarcey, the dramatic critic, would comment on the presentation of an Odéon play as being too "rive gauche"; that is to say, heavier and slower

was a varied one of clever and irresponsible *café* haunters, some Symbolists, some belonging to a set calling themselves the *Hydropathes* and meeting in a *brasserie* of the boulevard Saint-Michel. Rodolphe Salis set up a literary *cabaret* in the beginning of the eighties on Montmartre, to which he gave the name of *le Chat noir* in memory of Poe and Baudelaire, and it was not long before the hill, the "butte sacrée," was sprinkled with bohemian, artistic, and literary taverns. The "gentilhomme" Salis and his set manifested the usual disdain for the *bourgeois*, dubbed the "épicier," and the *Chat noir* had its tiny theatre and newspaper. The result was a grouping of minor poets who sang or declaimed their works, and who developed a common tradition.[1] Their songs were sometimes cheerful, sometimes

than one would expect to see at a theatre on the boulevards of the right bank. The parochialism of the quarters is illustrated by Gustave Kahn (*Symbolistes et décadents*) when, speaking of the early days of the Symbolist movement, he says: "Tout cela un peu bousingot [cf. p. 663], mais ce n'est la faute de personne, si les idées nouvelles germent dans les cerveaux jeunes, et que la jeunesse est un peu rive gauche [i.e. immature]. *Lutèce* et les *Déliquescences* [cf. p. 799] sont très rive gauche et pour cela fort incomplètes comme document à consulter. Car enfin, il y a deux rives. Ces jeunes gens ne s'en doutaient pas trop, et l'un d'eux, Stanislas de Guaïta, a donné la note exacte d'un certain état d'esprit, quand, après avoir énuméré dans une préface à un volume de vers, tous les nouveaux poètes existant à sa connaissance, doutant de son universalité il termina en disant: il y en a peut-être d'autres, mais je ne les connais pas; en tout cas, ils ne viennent pas à mon café." The modern underground railways are destroying the individuality of the Paris quarters, and Montmartre is chiefly a show place of vice for foreigners.

[1] Chansonniers pleins d'irrévérence
Envers les pouvoirs établis,
Bardes hautains et mal polis,
De qui déjà l'exubérance
S'affirmait chez les imprimeurs
Et sous la voûte odéonesque;[1]
Sur la galère chatnoiresque
Nous étions quatre-vingts rimeurs.

[1] The galleries of the Odéon theatre, with their booksellers' stalls.

lugubrious, more frequently than not off color, but always sarcastic, lampooning the government and social conventions. Among the poets of Montmartre have been Emile Goudeau (1849–1906), author of *les Fleurs de bitume;* Jules Jouy (1855–1897) who died insane, one of the creators of the *chanson macabre;* Victor Meusy (b. 1856); Maurice Mac-Nab (b. 1856); Fursy (Henry Dreyfus) (b. 1866), a specialist in *chansons rosses;* Xanrof (Léon Fourneau) (b. 1867); Jehan Rictus (Gabriel Randon) (b. 1867). The taverns are still numerous on Montmartre, but for the most part their glories have departed and the entertainments are apt to be, as at the music halls and *cafés concerts*, monotonous *revues* or embryo musical comedies, in which two chief characters, the *compère* and the *commère*, marshal an array of satellites who crack jokes and sing songs about important people and events.

The two most significant figures of literary Montmartre have been Bruant and Rollinat:

Aristide Bruant (b. 1851), who directed the Cabaret du Mirliton, wrote his songs and monologues in *argot* or slang, which will be as unintelligible to future generations as Villon's *jobelin*. His subjects are drawn from the scenes of misery and vice of the congested city (*Dans la rue* and *Sur la route*).

Maurice Rollinat (1846–1903), who even antedates the foundation of the *Chat noir* at which he was one of the performers,

> C'était un mélange hermétique
> Des produits les plus discordants;
> Symbolistes et décadents
> Y coudoyaient l'art romantique;
> De Krysinska les yeux charmeurs
> Y représentaient le beau sesque.[1]
> Sur la galère chatnoiresque
> Nous étions quatre-vingts rimeurs.
>
> ARMAND MASSON.

[1] Sexe.

was the one who most nearly approached genius. By a strange contrast this poet of city vices had a strong love for the country, especially for his native Berry and the haunts of his fellow-writer, George Sand. Yet he outdid the horrors and Satanism of his masters, Poe, Baudelaire, and Barbey d'Aurevilly. The *Névroses* are a wild collection of poems on disease and corruption, nor is it to be wondered at that Rollinat died insane:

Quand on aura fermé ma bière
Comme ma bouche et ma paupière,
Que l'on inscrive sur ma pierre:
—"Ci-gît le roi du mauvais sort.
Ce fou dont le cadavre dort
L'affreux sommeil de la matière,
Frémit pendant sa vie entière
Et ne songea qu'au cimetière.
Jour et nuit, par toute la terre,
Il traîna son cœur solitaire
Dans l'épouvante et le mystère,
Dans l'angoisse et le remord.
Vive la mort! Vive la mort!"

CHAPTER XVI

PHILOSOPHERS, HISTORIANS, ORATORS, CRITICS, AND JOURNALISTS

A STRIKING phenomenon of the nineteenth century has been the secession from literature of science after science. In the sixteenth century the poet and scholar were one, in the seventeenth century Cartesianism was a subject for discussion in literary drawing-rooms, in the eighteenth century astronomy or natural history belonged to literature, in the early nineteenth history was linked with the historical novel and with sociological utopias. Subjects successively branched off until, with few exceptions, as in the systems of Taine and Renan, philosophy, history, natural history, astronomy became purely technical. A bond of connection remains, however, when philosophical theories penetrate literature indirectly or in a popularised form: the theory of evolution, influenced both by empirical theories of Positivism and by the idea of the processus of historical growth, again ventures into criticism in its application by Brunetière to literature. Or the theories of Claude Bernard are employed with false analogies by the "Naturalists," and a literary generation prides itself on being "scientific."

In philosophy the two great antithetical currents of Positivism and Idealism or Spiritualism remained long in presence. Positivism, continuing the general tendencies of Comte, took hold, through the influence of writers like Taine, of the popular fancy, or with experimentalists of the type of Théodule Ribot (b. 1839) of men of science. Ribot, professor at the Collège de France, director of the *Revue philosophique*, and author of important works such as *l'Hérédité psychologique*, was the initiator in France

of the study of pathological manifestations and similar applications of experimental psychology.

Among the spiritualists Cousin long remained the traditional and conventional authority, and Paul Janet (1823–1899) inherited some of his influence on education. Elme Caro (1826–1887) was the popular orator for ladies and professor at the Sorbonne, of the Catholic party, as well as a distinguished literary critic. Félix Ravaisson (1813–1900), author of a thesis on *l'Habitude* and of a *Rapport sur la philosophie en France au XIXe siècle*, ranked high among the idealistic technical philosophers. Etienne Vacherot (1809–1897), as the radical wing of the spiritualists and a former disciple of Cousin, was a more technical writer than Taine in most of his books on the relations of metaphysics and science, and shocked people by his views on the non-existence of God except as an ideal without reality. The Père Gratry (1805–1872), an Oratorian, was Vacherot's great opponent in the controversy on God.

When Cousin's Eclecticism was exhausted, thinkers who did not want to go over to materialism found refuge in a new critical philosophy or neo-Kantism. Jules Lachelier (b. 1832), a man of practically one book expounding a teleological theory of induction, has had far greater influence than his literary production implies on French university students and *normaliens*. Renan called him "l'inventeur du mouvement tournant le plus surprenant des temps modernes depuis Kant." The builder of the most complete system was Charles Renouvier (1815–1903). Certain significant parts of Renouvier's philosophy fitted in with the liberal reaction in the third Republic against monarchy and imperialism, and his anti-Catholic attitude satisfied the Protestants and agnostics who, without being materialists or perhaps even Darwinian determinists, were eager to laicise the French government and education, and who for many years after the resignation of Mac Mahon had an influence in politics and education greater than mere numbers would lead one to suppose. Renouvier's actual school was, however, a small one,

The philosophy of Renouvier was a neo-Kantism. He called it first a neo-criticism, later a new monadology, and finally Personalism, as different and sometimes mutually inconsistent parts of his doctrine were uppermost in his mind. He undertook to pursue the method of Kant to even more logical extremes. Not only he wished to bring thought back to Kantian accuracy from the vagueness of the post-Kantian romantic metaphysical pantheists, just as once before Descartes had given a method to France, but he wished also to do away with some glaring inconsistencies of Kant's philosophy, such as Kant's restoration for all real purposes of the noumenon, the thing-in-itself (*Ding an sich*), which criticism had just determined to be unknowable. Renouvier undertook to get rid of the absolute and to confine himself to pure phenomena, thereby borrowing much from the traditions of the English thinkers of the school of Hume down to those of a French positivist like Comte. He saw, therefore, only positive phenomena or representations, but he bridged the chasm which had worried philosophers ever since the creation of the Cartesian dualism by arguing a double aspect to each of these representations, that which represents and that which is represented; just as, to use a figure which Sainte-Beuve employs in another connection, a hollow is the thing most like a hump. Renouvier thus created subject-object monads which unite in themselves by a sort of Leibnitzian harmony, as different aspects of the same things, what had been looked upon as distinct subjects and objects.

The representations of Renouvier are linked together by relations or categories and do not depend upon a substance or soul, but upon what is at most a law of personality: this is all we can assert that the "ego" amounts to. As to other selves, if we cannot prove their existence, we cannot prove their non-existence, and we have a right to assume them.

Such a method might seem to lead to the ultra-phenomenalism of some of the rationalists, but Renouvier, nevertheless, by denying the idea of the infinite, found place in his philosophy

for the unifying principle of causation and, unexpectedly, for the ideas of free-will and of an absolute beginning. This people may be justified in calling God, and so Renouvier did ultimately call it. Himself an opponent of Catholicism and of revealed religions, he encouraged the French *libres penseurs* to adhere to the reformed religion; not necessarily because of belief in the tenets of Protestantism, but in order to avoid creating new and weak churches. His ethical principles were stoical in tendency and rested on justice rather than on sympathy or mercy.

Renouvier expressed his views, besides by his books, in the *Critique philosophique* and the *Année philosophique*, old and new. He was succeeded in the direction of the latter by his chief disciple François Pillon (b. 1830).

Sociology, a science created by Comte, has become a favorite study, but many sociologists have been influenced by the English evolutionists of the Spencerian school. Emile Durkheim (b. 1858) conceives society as a real "entity" with its own laws; Gabriel Tarde (1843–1904), of a more imaginative and even poetical temperament, made the bases of society rest on the individual and in his studies emphasised the intuitive side. His most important writings are connected with the theory of imitation and with criminality as a form of social psychology. Tarde was an opponent of Lombroso's theories of a criminal type and considered crime as a social, not an anthropological result.

A transition from philosophy to sociology is also found in Jean-Marie Guyau (1854–1888), a stepson and first cousin once removed of Fouillée, by whose "idées-forces" he was somewhat influenced. Guyau's well filled life was ended by consumption at the age of thirty-three, yet he had already made himself by his writings an influence among young men who sought to conciliate evolutionary science with idealism and to avoid the eccentric egotism of many contemporary æsthetes in literature and art. To Guyau life is instinct with a vital principle which tends toward solidarity in place of an isolated development. Life is social by essence, and the obligation of morality rests on

the principle "je puis, donc je dois"; its sanction depends on the freedom or autonomy of one's own action, and morality becomes the disinterested love of humanity. Future religion will be an irreligion of liberty, with a negation of dogma and no supernatural sanction, and will consist in solidarity with the cosmos. Art is the æsthetic of beauty blossoming amid social sympathy. Guyau was the poet-philosopher of idealistic irreligion or religion without dogma and of an attempt to merge socialism and individualism.

The moralists of the last two generations have, to an important extent, dealt with questions of education and have been rather statesmen or pedagogues than observers such as La Bruyère. Ximénès Doudan (1800–1872) has, indeed, been compared with La Bruyère, but it was partly because, like him, he was a private tutor, in the De Broglie noble family. The Swiss professor Henri-Frédéric Amiel (1821–1881), burdened with Schopenhauerian pessimism, is known by his posthumous *Journal intime*, revealing a soul made ineffective through excessive introspection. On the other hand, action is born from the spoken or written words of those who tried to make the third Republic rest on the firm foundation of education. Victor Duruy reorganised secondary instruction under the Empire and encouraged higher studies by the Ecole des Hautes Etudes. Jules Simon (1814–1896), the former secretary and follower of Victor Cousin, having become minister of Public Instruction and pursuing the dreams of Duruy, began the educational reforms which have been so important since the fall of the Empire, particularly as to free and obligatory instruction. Jules Ferry (1832–1893) and Paul Bert (1833–1886) advocated in Parliament reforms such as the laicisation of instruction. Octave Gréard (1828–1904), university teacher and vice-rector of the Academy of Paris, did not confine himself to problems of superior instruction, but was an authority on primary and secondary teaching as well. One of the accomplishments of the third Republic has been to modernise instruction, even at the great risk of injur-

ing its cultural classical value, and to transform the university from a home of easy public lectures to a resort of international scholarship.

In history few writers, apart from Taine and Renan, are really men of letters. Taine has been the ideal of many historians for the authority of his utterances, but they have tried to pursue a more scientific and unbiassed method. Erudition has, moreover, replaced style. Specialisation has become so great that the important histories of general subjects now tend to be co-operative and collaborative. The most original historian, next to Taine and Renan, was Fustel de Coulanges (1830–1889) who came from the school of Guizot. To him, as against Taine and Renan, history was an end in itself, a pure science. His literary production is divided into two halves. During the first period, of which *la Cité antique* is the best known work, he endeavored to give large historical syntheses. They are based, it is true, on the careful study of original documents, but by his intentional neglect of what his contemporary writers had said, he exposed himself to the charge of incomplete knowledge and of bias. In answer to these attacks he changed his own method and became a no less painstaking but more ingenuous methodical plodder. Fustel de Coulanges's sole ideal was truth and accuracy. In the latter respect he was liable to error because of his lack of equipment as a palæographist. But he is the type of historical sincerity, especially when even the slight tendency to synthesis due to the early German historians had given way to the cult of the text. His chief work, apart from the *Cité antique*, was the *Histoire des institutions politiques de l'ancienne France*.

Among the other important historians of the second half of the nineteenth century there was Gaston Boissier (1823–1908), a somewhat miscellaneous writer, studying the spirit of different ages or individuals, such as the times of Cicero, the Roman Empire, or great men and women of French literature. Albert Sorel (1842–1906), a pupil of Taine, dealt with the Franco-

Prussian war, the Orient in the eighteenth century, or Europe and the French Revolution. Albert Vandal (1853–1910) wrote on the times of Napoleon. The leading contemporary historians, Aulard, Langlois, Lavisse, Monod, and Seignobos are scholars primarily and men of letters in a subsidiary sense.

During a large part of the second Empire political oratory was crushed under a benevolent Cæsarism, and the bar and the pulpit were the chief outlets for eloquence. Mgr Félix Dupanloup (1802–1878) and Cardinal Lavigerie (1825–1892) were great names in the Catholic Church, and the latter tried to help the policy of Leo XIII to bring the Church and the Republic together. Later, the P. Henri Didon (1840–1900) tried the dangerous task in France of uniting liberalism and Catholicism. Athanase Coquerel (1795–1868) was one of the founders of liberal Protestantism. The P. Hyacinthe Loyson (b. 1827), a monk excommunicated for the philosophical liberalism of his views, declared that he remained no less a Catholic and tried to organise, without much success, a Catholic Gallican church.

Political eloquence under Napoleon III was at first chiefly confined to a small band of opposition orators known as "les Cinq," but the policy of "l'empire libéral" after 1867 made speaking more general. Jules Favre (1809–1880) and Ernest Picard (1821–1877) were the consistent foes of the Empire; Emile Ollivier (b. 1825) went over to the "empire libéral" and was at the head of the ministry near the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war. Eugène Rouher (1814–1884) was the chief spokesman for the emperor.

In the early days of the third Republic Thiers, as head of the government, defended his policies before the National Assembly. Buffet (1818–1898) and the duc de Broglie (1821–1901) were conservative leaders. The great tribune of the generation was Léon Gambetta (1838–1882), a characteristically voluble southern orator. He opposed the Empire, took a leading part in the patriotic resistance during the war, and devised under the Republic the policy of opportunism, of general advance by adap-

tation to circumstance. Gambetta was noted for picturesque phrases summing up an idea or a situation: "le cléricalisme, voilà l'ennemi," or "se soumettre ou se démettre." But his general style was loose and flabby, except as the projection outward of his physical vigor. A greater constructive statesman than Gambetta was Jules Ferry, though he did not possess the former's readiness of speech and was the victim of much political injustice. Charles de Freycinet (b. 1828), the "little white mouse," has been the great trimmer of politics. Challemel-Lacour (1827–1896) had the temperament of a philosopher of pessimism and was a scholar in politics. Mgr Freppel (1827–1891), bishop of Angers, was a clerical leader in the Chamber of Deputies.

At the end of the nineteenth century, during the turmoil of the Dreyfus case, when France was rent in twain by dissension, the nation was saved by the patriotism of René Waldeck-Rousseau (1846–1904), a former political lieutenant of Gambetta, who had, however, left politics to become a leader of the bar. The secret of Waldeck-Rousseau's power lay not merely in his intellect, but in his ability to remain cool amid the frenzied attacks of political opponents. In carrying out his policies he was sometimes less rigid than in formulating them, and they were dragged from his control by more radical politicians.

The history of criticism is closely linked with journalism, inasmuch as most critics found expression in newspapers and reviews. Others belonged to the university world. Sainte-Beuve was the leader of his generation, Théophile Gautier the unwilling slave of the pen. Paul de Saint-Victor (1825–1881) was a Romantic enthusiast; Edmond Scherer (1815–1889) on the contrary, was the cold analyst of intellects, generally lacking in enthusiasm, and prone to interpret life and literature in a tone of pessimism; J.-J. Weiss (1827–1891) was a journalist and dramatic critic somewhat fickle in his attitude; Emile Montégut (1825–1895) made English literature known in France; and the vicomte Eugène Melchior de Vogüé (1848–1910) by his book

on *le Roman russe* in 1886 revealed Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky, and set the vogue in France of Russian literature and its religion of human suffering. He was also important in initiating the moral movement called "néo-christianisme." Among dramatic critics Francisque Sarcey (1828–1899), a brilliant *normalien* turned lecturer and theatrical reviewer for the *Temps*, long enjoyed an already passing fame. Sarcey dwelt too determinedly on the formal structure of a play and admired a "pièce bien faite," even though its climaxes were claptrap and melodramatic. He was the mouthpiece of the average-minded theatre-goer of *bourgeois* temperament, tending to follow rather than to lead, jovial and good-natured in his criticism, and known to all Paris as "Uncle Sarcey."

The most noteworthy critic of his generation and ranking in general prominence next to Sainte-Beuve, though at some distance from him, was Ferdinand Brunetière (1849–1906). After failing as a student to obtain admission to the Ecole normale and therefore never holding a degree higher than the insignificant *baccalauréat*, Brunetière lived to see himself lecturer at that school, member of the Academy, director of the *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, and the most talked of critic in France. He represents the dogmatic school, as opposed to his rivals of the impressionistic type, such as Jules Lemaître and Anatole France. He was a successor of the Nisard tradition in glorifying the seventeenth century. But he strengthened his judgments by comparison with other European literatures, so that his classifications rest on a broader foundation than the age of Louis XIV. Nevertheless, Brunetière's first-hand knowledge of modern literatures outside of his own appears to have been small, and his familiarity with, for instance, Italian literature seems to rest largely on the manual of De Sanctis.

Brunetière early gained admission to the pages of the *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, with the conservatism of which he was in sympathy, and he proceeded to overturn many false gods, beginning with the Naturalists whom he flayed in *le Roman*

naturaliste. The acerbity of his manner and his numerous controversies made him countless enemies, and though most of his victims deserved their fate, one cannot help occasionally sympathising with the vanquished and deeming the victor lacking in magnanimity.

Yet Brunetière was not tilting against windmills at random. His theory was a consistent one and was a method of objective criticism for the classification, explanation, and judgment of works, particularly as expressions of general ideas. He did not seek pleasure in a book or value it because of "sweetness" or "charm," but because of its worth in ideas. Consequently, the great men to him were those of the seventeenth century as the exponents of reason, and among them such writers as Boileau, or Bossuet.

Though Brunetière was at variance with the philologists in valuing a work for its content and not for its linguistic problems (he knew little of the Middle Ages), and at variance with the historians in valuing it for its own meaning instead of its chronological significance chiefly, his critical method was not a static one and soon acquired an historical form, though of a peculiar kind. He undertook to apply the methods of science then in vogue to the study of literature and to trace the evolution of literary types, thus posing as a follower of Darwin and Haeckel. The problem was, then, to take the different *genres*, such as criticism itself or lyrical poetry in the nineteenth century, and show how the apparent entity was moulded and transformed. The method involved a certain amount of selection on *a priori* or artificial grounds to meet the theory and the arbitrary omission of some names for the reason that, though intrinsically interesting, they were unimportant in the evolution. It sometimes meant undue emphasis as well as neglect. In consequence, Brunetière's critical method is already becoming obsolete.

On the other hand, when Brunetière studies an individual author or a single period, and when he avoids unwise generalisations based on insufficient knowledge, he is unequalled in eliciting

a true interpretation. He occasionally skilfully traces the filiation of ideas between one generation and another, and picks out the influences which illustrate his evolutionary theory. In the history of the Renaissance Brunetière made some interesting discoveries and proved the real value of certain neglected or misinterpreted personalities. Consequently his work on the sixteenth century is suggestive, but not definitive. In the study of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries he is unequalled, though his attitude toward the latter period is rather hostile; in the nineteenth century his prejudices sometimes impair his judgment, but he is everywhere a doughty opponent. He fought not like a knight of chivalry, but as some *doctor irrefragabilis* of Scholasticism.

Brunetière's lack of sympathy with radicalism and his respect for tradition led him to become a constantly greater intellectual conservative and to draw closer to the Catholic Church. During and after the Dreyfus affair he argued the bankruptcy of science, the necessity of belief. He suffered in consequence persecution from an anti-clerical government which dropped him from his position at the Ecole normale when it was merged into the university and prevented his selection as professor at the Collège de France. But his militant temperament was unbroken.

Brunetière's style corresponds to his character: it is vigorous and effective, yet ponderous and clumsy in its actual expression. His sentences are often long and involved, broken up with *qui* and *que*, as was frequently the practice of seventeenth-century writers, and his favorite shibboleths, such as "que si" and "comme qui dirait" are often irritating.

Brunetière's works include many volumes of essays collected under general titles as *Etudes critiques*, *Histoire et littérature*, *Questions de critique*, etc; studies in application of his theory, like *l'Evolution de la critique, les Epoques du théâtre français*, and *l'Evolution de la poésie lyrique en France au dix-neuvième siècle*. He wrote also an important one-volume manual of French literature and the first volume of a larger *Histoire de la littérature*

classique, dealing with the sixteenth century. Others among his miscellaneous titles were various *Discours académiques* and *Discours de combat* and a study of Balzac.

Under the benevolent despotism of the second Empire the press was successfully gagged and velleities of opposition were suppressed. The *Moniteur Universel*, which included among its contributors Gautier, Mérimée, and Sainte-Beuve, was one of the leading papers and a semi-official organ. The *Constitutionnel* also had Sainte-Beuve on its staff. Louis Veuillot led the ultra-clerical party in the *Univers*. The *Journal des Débats* was the sober and intellectual opposition newspaper with brilliant contributors forming a sort of club under Edouard Bertin and including Renan, Taine, Ernest Bersot (1816–1880), Emile Deschanel (1819–1904), Saint-Marc Girardin, Jules Janin, Silvestre de Sacy (1801–1879), Edouard de Laboulaye (1811–1883), John Lemoinne (1815–1892), and Prévost-Paradol. These various writers belonged for the most part to the university as well as to journalism. Prévost-Paradol (1829–1870), one of the most brilliant, after long opposition to the Empire rallied to it just before the war, was appointed minister to Washington, and committed suicide there. During the earlier part of the Empire Emile de Girardin's *Presse* and the *Siècle* were democratic organs. In 1861 an older sheet, the *Temps*, which had lapsed, was revived by Auguste Nefftzer. It became and has remained, with the *Débats*, the chief organ of conservative republican and solid opinion in France, heavy and respectable, with Protestant inclinations, not widely read but much quoted. In 1863 the first "journal à un sou," the *Petit Journal*, dubbed the "journal des concierges," was founded, an event which was destined to revolutionise journalism and deteriorate the quality of the general press. Toward the end of the Empire the *Journal de Paris*, under J.-J. Weiss and Edouard Hervé, drew to itself some of the opposition strength. After 1860 the press had greater liberty.

The freedom from stamp tax enjoyed by literary papers favored their growth considerably. Chief among those of the em-

pire were the *Figaro*, *la Vie parisienne*, and *le Nain jaune*. The *Figaro* appeared in 1854. It was founded by Jean-Hippolyte Cartier (1812–1879), calling himself H. de Villemessant, who by his choice of collaborators gave it a smart tone, part literary, part social, part theatrical, which it has generally tried to maintain, on the principle that Paris is more important than the rest of the world and that the rest of the world is chiefly interested in the small doings of Paris. The *Vie parisienne*, of Marcelin (Émile Planat), a still more smart and semi-literary weekly, began in 1862. Aurélien Scholl's *Nain jaune* (1863) was literary, satirical, and political. At the end of the Empire the foul-mouthed and vituperative Henri Rochefort, the marquis de Rochefort-Luçay become proletarian, started the *Lanterne*, a series of pamphlets of vehement political satire, but not yet the daily *Lanterne* which he founded in 1876.

Journalism played an important part under the third Republic. In the *République française* Gambetta and his aids, including Eugène Spuller, advocated opportunism; Edmond About was the life of the *XIXe Siècle;* the *Soleil* under Edouard Hervé upheld in a dignified manner Orleanist monarchical principles; Paul de Cassagnac was a virulent Bonapartist in *le Pays* and *l'Autorité;* the *Evénement* and the *Voltaire* had a transitory influence; Emile de Girardin fought the government of Mac Mahon and the threatened *coup d'état* of May 16, 1877, in *la France;* the *Gaulois*, an old sheet reanimated by Arthur Meyer, tried to be a pseudo-*Figaro* and the organ of the Faubourg Saint-Germain. Meanwhile the *Petit Parisien* imitated the success of the *Petit Journal* as a "journal à un sou." In 1880 Clemenceau preached radicalism in the *Justice;* Rochefort used filthy language in the *Intransigeant;* and the *Gil Blas* made a specialty of *risqué* stories and pornographic literature. The *République française*, was the organ of Jules Méline and the protectionists. The *Matin*, the military and anti-foreign *Eclair*, the *Journal* ranged from the simple gathering of news to a pretence of literary journalism.

The Dreyfus agitation between 1895 and 1899 stirred French journalism through and through. The *Figaro* lost much of its power by advocating the revision of the verdict of the first court-martial which had condemned Dreyfus. The anti-Semitic troubles were largely fomented by Edouard Drumont and *la Libre Parole*, in which he called for the massacre of Jewish capitalists and of Jews in general. The *Echo de Paris* was the organ of the "nationalist" society called the *Patrie française*. The Assumptionist fathers preached a Holy War in the various local editions of *la Croix*, the "bonne presse." More violent partisans of justice than the timid *Temps* and *Débats* were Clemenceau's *Aurore*, in which Zola published his famous letter "J'accuse," and transitory sheets like *les Droits de l'Homme*. Still later Jaurès's socialistic *Humanité*, Henri Bérenger's *Action*, and the *Petite République* have catered to the "advanced" political parties. The royalist Léon Daudet in the *Action française*, the anti-military writer Gustave Hervé, and the Ishmael of journalism, Urbain Gohier, have been talked about.

During the last few years French journalism has deviated more and more from any claim to literature. Only the *Temps* and the *Débats* maintain a semblance of literary and dramatic criticism; the other numberless dailies content themselves largely with paid puffs and log-rolling notices; the *feuilletons* tend to be more and more sensational and cater to the *concierge* as much as to the *bourgeois*.

The reviews have been in proportion no less numerous. The *Revue des Deux-Mondes* still leads in dignity and ponderousness followed by minor companions such as the *Revue de Paris*, the *Nouvelle Revue* of Mme Adam (Juliette Lamber), the old clerical *Correspondant*, the new *Mercure de France*, the mouthpiece of the literary unconventionals, the weekly *Revue bleue*, and others, too numerous to mention.

PART VI

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

CHAPTER I

THE TENDENCIES

THE opening decade of the twentieth century seems, like so many corresponding periods in previous ages, to mark in some respects a new beginning or a new state of affairs. The most important force affecting it was probably the Dreyfus case, remote from literature as that political dispute seems to be. It had as much influence in producing internal cleavages as a civil war, and the victim was only a symbol in a much greater contest.

The beginning of public discussion over Alfred Dreyfus was at the very end of 1894, when this Jewish captain, attached to the general staff, was erroneously and illegally convicted by a court-martial, upon evidence supplied to the court without the knowledge of the defendant's counsel, and sentenced to deportation to French Guiana for supplying information to the German military attaché at Paris, a crime really committed by one Major Esterhazy. It was not long before doubts began to arise in the minds of some who, like Colonel (afterward General) Picquart, had witnessed the trial or who, like Scheurer-Kestner, became interested in it, and vigorous efforts were made to secure a retrial. Unfortunately the matter was dragged into politics, until Dreyfus's name became chiefly a rallying cry. Though anti-Semitism had hitherto not been very violent in France, prejudice against the Jews had grown up owing to jealousy of their financial influence, and this feeling was fanned into hate by Drumont with his book *la France juive* and his paper *la Libre Parole*. There was also jealousy against the Protestants for having acquired an intellectual pre-eminence in

the universities beyond their numerical importance. On the other hand, the army was to an undue degree officered by men brought up in clerical schools, as a result of the Jesuits' usual policy for obtaining power. In the present case they had the post of vantage in objecting to reopen a "chose jugée" and held the "nationalists" or jingoes in control by calling attacks on the court-martial attacks on the army and the national prestige.

Thus the Dreyfus case divided France into two camps, often splitting families and turning relations into enemies. One party included the liberals and partisans of justice, among whom was a band of much ridiculed "intellectuels," writers and university professors, who were taunted much as the "scholar in politics" has been laughed at in America. The other party was made up of the conservatives, the clericals, the jingoes, and the unthinking majority, dazzled by the tirades of the generals and morbidly afraid, as Frenchmen of all times have been, of traitors. The socialist party, which was at first not disposed to interfere, finally sided with the Dreyfusites, and in time (1906) Dreyfus was rehabilitated, though the long agony, including the Zola trial and the second condemnation by the Rennes court-martial in 1899, produced bitternesses which time is only now healing.

The result of the trouble was to make religious discussion more prominent than ever. The Dreyfusites, as anti-clericals, on acquiring control began to make reprisals, and the advanced radicals and socialists, who had occupied an important tactical position, reaped the chief advantage. The disestablishment of the Church followed and a displacement of the centre of gravity of French politics toward what is called the Left, the radical-socialists and the socialists. Hence, besides religion, socialism or other forms of the labor question have been the great subjects under discussion during the decade, and the whole intellectual life has been influenced by them. Moreover, the election of Pius X to the papacy and his new policy of obscurantism made the religious problems, such as Modernism, more acute.

The growth of syndicalism and the advocacy of strikes have made social problems no less prominent and, according to the usual French tendency, efforts have been made to work out general principles for them. For, not only should we by this time be convinced of the Frenchman's aptitude for general ideas, but philosophy is more systematically taught even in French secondary schools than in England or America, and French philosophy is represented by active teachers and pedagogues. The direction of French thought during the last few years has been toward scientific rather than literary ideals and toward collective or sociological impulses. Pure literature has suffered. For once schools have split up and disorganised, so that it is difficult to indicate a dominating principle in belles-lettres.

A good deal has been contributed to this end through the all-pervading influence of a new philosophy somewhat dissolvent of standards of taste. This is Pragmatism, so closely connected with the name of the late Professor William James of Harvard, whose reputation in France is almost as great as it is in his own country. Pragmatism, which is largely the result of dissatisfaction with science for not solving the problems it planned to master and not bringing us any nearer to the key to the unknown, is a revolt against rationalism and intellectualism in general, against Hegel and the cult of science which in France prevailed after the decline of Cousin's eclecticism. It is a return to a form of the old pre-Socratic doctrine of Protagoras that "Man is the measure of all things," and justifies the use as truth of that which at any time seems best to explain the difficulties. As a philosophy of values which pay, it is a kind of utilitarianism transferred from ethics to epistemology, but in its American form it remains, as its name implies, practical and scarcely ventures to penetrate beyond the changes of what may perhaps long remain unknown. And as a frank acceptance of shifting standards and a philosophy of flux, Pragmatism could be made to account for varying social and mental phenomena. Hence

we find it taken as an explanation for many French tendencies of the last decade, and most of those which are not directly connected with it proceed from principles indicative of a general spirit of the times akin to it.

The great contemporary equivalent of the pragmatic tendency in France is the philosophy of Bergsonism, though M. Henri Bergson (b. 1859) denies any direct influence upon him of the philosophy of William James. Certainly there is a kinship between a philosophy like Pragmatism, in which the criterion is a practical one and truth is made and remade, and a philosophy of flux and metaphysics of constant change. Both are a revolt against the positivistic and scientific intellectualism which, like all other systems, had failed to solve the problem of the relation of mind and matter and had, in so many people, led to scepticism. So novel and unexpected is Bergson's solution that, particularly since the publication of his *Evolution créatrice* in 1907, his enthusiastic admirers have compared his revolutionary influence in thought to that of a new Kant, himself a Copernicus of pure thought.

Bergson's desire is to bring together the two antithetical elements of the world, those of life and matter, and unite them in a single synthesis. For that reason the terms used to characterise the various tendencies of philosophical discussion meet in his system in a jumbled reconciliation of *frères ennemis*. In so far as he believes that the ultimate reality is psychic, he is an idealist; in so far as he believes that knowledge can grasp reality and overstep the intellect, he is a realist. In fact, one of the chief differences between Pragmatism and Bergsonism is the pretence of the French philosophy to grasp the absolute itself. Bergsonism goes beyond criticism and undertakes to annex the acquisitions of science, whether biology, psychology, or geology, into a new philosophy explaining their changes. It is hostile to the old doctrine of substances, essences, or "things in themselves." It sees everything in constant change or evolution. But this evolution is neither an idealistic and logical

Hegelian antithesis of ego and non-ego coalescing in a superior synthesis, nor an external Darwinian mechanism, in which matter is the victim of its environment. It is a theory of *vitalism*, in which the changing act of evolution is life itself — a creative evolution, moreover, which produces not only the intellect but things, and thus does away with the dualism which has troubled philosophers from Descartes until now.

The stages of Bergson's development are seen in his three chief works, the *Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience*, *Matière et mémoire*, and *l'Evolution créatrice*. He began as a mathematician influenced by Boutroux's book *De la contingence des lois de la nature*, the theories of the mathematician H. Poincaré on the relativism of the laws of science except as conventions, and Renouvier's attacks on Kant's supra-temporal and changeless ego. He thus became convinced of the insufficiency of mathematical abstractions, as in geometry and mechanics, and the tendency to conceive time in terms of space. Time seemed to him not divisible into static sections, but to be a real psychological experience of *durée réelle* and a dynamic process. The geometrical static world has no reality. Next, taking his stand in consciousness, he attacked the clearness of mathematics and the control of intellectualism, and asserted that all is activity and that consciousness creates the world.

Finally, in *l'Evolution créatrice* Bergson gave the metaphysics of his system: The essence of things is a great creative and life-giving impulse (*élan vital*), which is mind or consciousness, and of which knowledge is only a part. This creative evolution produces, on the one hand the intellect, on the other hand things, which are inverted conditions of the resultant of one force. Everywhere, except in man, the vital impulse has, in varying degrees, become stiffened and congealed into forms and mechanisms. In knowledge there are two elements, intelligence and instinct. Intelligence, possessed by man alone, enables him to triumph over mechanism, but has impaired his instinct, which is a divergent direction of the impulse of life. For instinct

does not precede intelligence, but goes with it and is more profound, so that the intellectual life is a smaller and really less significant part of the whole. Instinct makes us grasp and, through intuition, lay immediate hold upon what static science cannot understand: the interdependent, non-divisible, ever transformed, ever "becoming" reality, lying not in space but in continuous time. Of this reality the intellect can acquire only temporary and artificial cross-sections, which deal with relations and not realities, and which are, moreover, retrospective and not progressive as life really is. The categories which men use in reasoning are less accurate than the direct instinct of ants. Thus the essence of Bergson's philosophy is the cult of the instinctive. It is a poetic metaphysics which answers a strong though passing feeling of our time, but it can make no appeal to those who are unwilling to deny the pre-eminence of reason. It is a theory for the emotionalists, the impulsivists, in a word for those who represent the tendencies of neo-Romanticism. It is also a theory of pure relativism.

The ease with which Bergsonism adapts itself to nearly all the active tendencies of today has made it extremely popular among those interested in new religious, ethical, social, political, or æsthetic questions. Even the socialists talk of the *élan ouvrier* akin to the *élan vital*, and advocate strikes, not merely for the purpose of extorting better terms from the *bourgeoisie*, but as manifestations of the deep intuitions of solidarity among the proletariat. Ethically, it has encouraged those who, during the period of anti-clericalism accompanying the disestablishment of the Church, were looking for a justification for lay morality. Here it falls in with the tendencies of unconscious pragmatists. The French lay sociologist gets over moral and religious instability by the idea of a social organism which may impose its own sanctions, whether of law, public opinion, conscience, or reason: Durkheim, an extreme positivist, argues that God is society, and society furnishes to morals all the support one gets from revealed religion.

The orthodox Catholic Church, welded to immutable dogma, could not, of course, be expected to welcome Pragmatism. Indeed, long before the new philosophy became fashionable, it had practically committed itself, under the influence of Leo XIII, to neo-Thomism. This was a revival of Scholasticism, in the form given to Aristotelianism by Saint Thomas Aquinas, the greatest theologian of the Church. But it did not remain rigidly mediæval: it tried, on the contrary, to admit scientific thought and progress, even including laboratory methods. Belgium, among French-speaking countries, has been a home of neo-Thomism, which has flourished particularly at Louvain. In France itself it was difficult to uproot Descartes and Cousin from the seminaries, but neo-Thomism has had active defenders. The movement has been upheld by the active *Revue Thomiste*.

Other thinkers, not always more acute, but at any rate more venturesome, have introduced into their theories ideas akin to Pragmatism and have incurred corresponding papal displeasure, which extends in the case of the ex-abbé Loisy even to excommunication. Their tendencies are often lumped together under the name of Modernism, though the name is not accepted by all, and their views have different shades.

Religious restlessness had been somewhat prepared in the last years of the nineteenth century by a passing phase of "Americanism." This was a movement toward liberalism in practical morals, emanating originally in the United States from the teachings of Father Hecker, founder of the Paulists, and desirous like Lacordaire of reconciling the Church and democracy. Americanism emphasises those features which have always been prominent in modern American religious life: activity and good works, with less stress on dogma. It spread to France in the early nineties, partly by the influence of Archbishop Ireland of St. Paul, who had himself been educated in France and harked back to the political liberalism of Lamennais and of Montalembert. But the movement was frowned on by the Vatican. Moreover, a doctrine preached by a democratic priest in frock-

coat and trousers was hardly likely to prosper in a country which lays stress on ceremony and conceives a bishop only with robes, violet stockings, and an amethyst ring. The abbé Klein, the abbé Lemire, and a few laymen were, rightly or wrongly, reckoned among those who stood for the Americanist tendency. Catholic liberalism scarcely remained as an active force except in the small group called *le Sillon*, led by Marc Sangnier, which was finally condemned by Pius X in 1910.

Though French Americanism dwelt upon action, it expressed a feeling of restlessness which had its counterpart in thought in the significant Modernist movement of the early twentieth century. The modernist, like the pragmatist, is a relativist, and his desire is to adapt dogma to scientific progress by various theories of transformism. Bergson confines himself to a spiritualistic metaphysics, but the modernist approaches the problems of history and seeks for an answer. He exemplifies a method, an orientation, not a static creed, and he looks back to Cardinal Newman, the liberal who wanted to keep religion in touch with life, as the great precursor of Modernism within the Church. He likes to consider dogma, not as an immutable doctrine, but as a varying body of lessons which represent the different needs and aspirations of the ages. To be a Catholic for the modernist is to repeat the creed, not merely as a person confined to one time, but as one who forms part of a great Church which has lived through centuries of change and in its plasticity is responsive to thought and expressive of each generation. The modernist accepts the whole past of the Church, good or bad. Some modernists incline to a symbolic Christianity and a religion without dogma, just as there was no dogma in the religion of Christ's day. To speak of a Messiah coincided with the feelings of the Jewish prophets, to speak of a Logos satisfied the neo-Platonists; our age has a right to use some other term and speak of a Saviour or Revealer.

Some of the tendencies of the modernists may be even more technically expressed, though they occasionally overlap. There

is the attitude of the fideist, allied to Bergson and connected with Poincaré, though not identified with either. This is the feeling that science is arbitrary and that the laws of nature are only recipes for gaining control over phenomena. Hence the necessity of faith to establish what reason cannot prove. In so far as Pascal in the seventeenth century believed that God was "sensible au cœur, non à la raison," he was a fideist. The fideist, such as Edouard Le Roy, is not hostile to science, but considers it subordinate to faith. The immanentists, such as Maurice Blondel and the P. Laberthonnière, think that religion is not external but immanent, that the answer to this inner feeling is the fact of God, that it is awakened and developed in us by living the dogma in its evolution and experiencing even the contradictions of Christ's own life. The symbolist is a true pragmatist in that he thinks that the objects of faith are varying symbols and approximations of religion. So Loisy considers Christ less the representative of a doctrine than the initiator of a religious movement which has evolved in harmony with civilisation. To Loisy the resurrection of Christ is not a matter of history but of faith, God is the author of the Bible only as he is the architect of St. Peter's or Notre-Dame, and the fourth Gospel expressed what Professor James might have called a "variety of religious experience."

Important theologians, philosophers, and historians among the French modernists, some of them laymen, some of them priests, have been the abbé Loisy, Mgr Duchesne, Mgr Batiffol, the abbé Houtin, the P. Laberthonnière, Maurice Blondel, Georges Fonsegrive, Edouard Le Roy, and Wilbois. Most of them have been cautious enough to make exceptions safeguarding Catholic dogma. The abbé Loisy and the abbé Houtin have gone farthest.

The abbé Alfred Loisy (b. 1857), a former pupil of Mgr Duchesne, took the lead in the renovation of exegesis. One of the first sensations was created by an article of Mgr d'Hulst on the biblical question in the *Correspondant* in 1893. The new heresy was at first called concessionism, inasmuch as the biblical

critics were said to be making concessions to rationalism. Afterward it was named Loisysm before receiving the more general term of Modernism. An article by Edouard Le Roy in *la Quinzaine* in 1905, *Qu'est-ce qu'un dogme?* carried the discussion from history into philosophy. A decree of Pius X (*Lamentabili sane exitu*) in 1907 condemned sixty-five modernist propositions, and an encyclical (*Pascendi dominici gregis*) followed soon after. The discussion over Fogazzaro's *Il Santo* was an episode of Italian modernist controversy, and the fate of Father Tyrrell in England is well known.

In the sphere of education the last decade has not been one of uncontested progress, though the problems dealt with by the French are merely those which other nations have encountered. In secondary instruction a strong effort has been made to "modernise" education by reorganising the curriculum and putting the modern languages on a level with the classics. By the so-called reform of 1902 a number of "cycles" or courses of study were introduced, with the immediate consequence of almost wiping out Greek and of greatly diminishing the study of Latin. Under pretext of making education more democratic and popular, utilitarian and practical, the literary and humanistic studies were pressed into the background. The result is already appearing in complaints by teachers and examiners that students no longer know how to write their own language, and the "crise de l'enseignement secondaire" is a frequently discussed topic. A similar unrest appears in higher education and one also hears of the "crise de la Sorbonne."

Undeniably the third Republic has been the salvation of the universities. Not only has it reorganised the local faculties into independent universities, but it has supplied buildings and apparatus. Thus the spirit of the professors has changed: instead of aiming to be merely popular lecturers before miscellaneous audiences, they have become eager for the advancement of learning. The result shows itself in the great increase in the number of foreign students who resort to Paris.

But the charge is also brought that the scientific spirit is undermining literary culture. Unfortunately the discussion is complicated, as it is not in this country, by religious and political considerations, in the rise of which the Dreyfus case played again, a not inconsiderable part. The courageous "intellectuels" who, for reasons of intrinsic justice, were the first and foremost partisans of the revision of the trial were largely professors of the Sorbonne, the Ecole des Chartes, the scientific schools of Paris, and also of the provincial faculties. The political conditions which split France in two tended to draw them to the anti-clerical party and to side with the advanced groups of radicals or even of socialists, to the laboring men and the proletariat having no tradition of culture, and to whom education is merely a means of making a living. Education in a democratic state, it was said, was very properly going to the people. Greek and Latin were of less value than sociology. Moreover, humanistic subjects, especially Latin, the language of the priests, came at least unconsciously under the ban, because they suggested the wordy rhetorical studies which had been cultivated by the Jesuits and had so long controlled education: æsthetic appreciation, the "critique admirative" of literature was indissolubly bound up with a system which went back to the opponents of Pascal. Finally, the new methods were ultimately borrowed from Germany and, though MM. Liard and Lavisse have been their chief sponsors and promoters in France, they had an earlier advocate in Renan (intellectual aristocrat though he was), the bugbear of the clericals; consequently their representatives were anathema to the latter and to the obstreperous bands of royalists and reactionaries, who broke up lectures by the intellectual internationalists in the name of the recently beatified Jeanne d'Arc.[1] All this helps to explain why the French universities tend to join hands with the proletariat. They were

[1] A "camelot du roi," manifesting against a professor of the Sorbonne, might not analyse his feelings so fully, but the various causes are intermingled.

encouraged in this tendency by a radical government which liked to have free speech all on one side and which, by administrative decree, legislated Brunetière out of his office at the Ecole Normale because he was considered too reactionary.[1]

The results have not, it is affirmed, been encouraging to the friends of true literature, which consists neither in historical study alone, nor in mere superficial æsthetic appreciation. Not only do students arrive at the Sorbonne ill-trained in their own language, less familiar than formerly with the Latin on which it is based, and encouraged to slovenliness by the numerous grammatical mistakes (*tolérances*) which are no longer counted against them, but many of the teachers do not react against this state of affairs. They are no longer interested in the judgment and valuation of an author or his work: it reminds them too much of the somnolent university life during the second Empire. Their single method is the German historical one. This is applied, not only to history itself whence it has banished generalisation and synthesis in favor of the collecting of documents, but also to literature. The methods of the German mediævalists have spread from the Ecole des Chartes and from those trained under the Germans to the study of all literature. The cult of the card-catalogue, the collecting of *fiches* or "ficho-

[1] The sincerity of the attacks on the Sorbonne is in part vitiated by the political animus of the critics. They belong largely to the noisy band of royalists forming the group of the *Action française* and having as mouthpiece the newspaper of that name, organ of Léon Daudet, Charles Maurras, and Pierre Lasserre. In addition to their attacks on the scholarship of the university, they have sworn hatred against the Romantic school, because the Romanticists were, after the first period, for the most part liberals and republicans. They preach a return to what they call Classicism, but it is a neo-Classicism rather than the true seventeenth-century spirit. The literary men of the *Action française*, even when positivists, are "traditionalists" of the type of Joseph de Maistre and use the vituperation of Veuillot. Their political policy, based on the continued assumption of the guilt of Dreyfus, has four bugbears: Jews, Protestants, freemasons, and "métèques" or metics, i.e. new settlers in France, who are supposed not to inherit the national traditions.

manie," rages as violently in France as it does in America, and the French doctorate dissertations are becoming burdened with undigested and indigestible material. The qualities of which the French were so proud, clearness, order, and precision in presentation, are now relegated to the background in favor of the tasks of the intellectual mechanic: catalogues, bibliographies, and critical apparatus.

The new order of things, which has come about mainly in the last ten years, has its chief representative in Gustave Lanson, the most eminent living French professional scholar in the teaching of the history of modern literature. A significant instance of M. Lanson's own transformation is seen in his famous history of French literature. In the first edition, published in 1894, he devoted much attention to the thinkers of French literature and to the analysis of ideas. In the preface to the eleventh edition (1909) he regrets not having given more attention to writers "qui n'attachent de prix aux idées qu'en raison des faits qu'elles expriment et de la prise qu'elles donnent sur les faits." Fearful of departing from the historical method in his own case, and scientifically desirous not to deprive the student of the successive stages of his own thoughts, even when they have changed, he refrains from remodelling the text to any extent, and adds notes to indicate the variations of his opinions.[1]

In politics the first decade of the twentieth century has been marked by a progress to radicalism and socialism, though politicians on assuming responsibility have sometimes become more moderate. Among the orators or holders of office, Combes has been the modern Jacobin, Jaurès the loquacious southerner wasting his great ability in demagogy, Clemenceau a Warwick of cabinets before becoming himself prime minister. Henri

[1] "Mais, dans les matières de sentiment et d'opinion, il m'a paru qu'il serait dangereux de me borner à substituer un jugement à un autre: il y aurait de quoi dérouter les jeunes gens qui rencontreraient des affirmations différentes, selon qu'ils prendraient cette édition ou l'une des précédentes. Il m'a paru meilleur de leur montrer moi-même en quoi j'ai varié."

Brisson has posed as the austere Roman, Alexandre Ribot has been the rigid moderate, the comte de Mun has been a good defender of the Catholic opposition, and Léon Bourgeois and Raymond Poincaré have distinguished themselves. Aristide Briand, the socialist who carried through the separation bill, become later moderate, has the gift of Waldeck-Rousseau of remaining absolutely calm in the stormy tumult of debate in the Chamber of Deputies.

In pure literature there is very little to record, and the tendency has been to the disintegration of literary schools, particularly in poetry, without very marked individual works to replace them. At one time a great deal was heard about certain new schools destined to replace the Parnassians or the Symbolists and to conceive a new relation of art and life: the Naturism (not Naturalism) of Saint-Georges de Bouhélier, the Humanism of Fernand Gregh, the Integralism of Adolphe Lacuzon. Of these writers, only Saint-Georges de Bouhélier is active in maintaining his individual shibboleth, and most writers have had to work out their separate salvation. The novel has languished: plenty of novels have appeared, but few will survive. *Jean-Christophe* by Romain Rolland, which has been one of the most talked of and is planned to include ten volumes, is scarcely a technical novel. Anatole France, who in reputation stands head and shoulders above his contemporaries, cannot evolve a good plot in fiction and is driven to ironical apologues or semi-critical and satirical disquisitions. Some authors have shown talent in "writing up" political or social problems in the form of fiction: questions of socialism, militarism, clericalism, a number of which have only a passing interest. Others, under the pretext of pointing out moral evils, have continued to cultivate the vein of the Naturalists, though with less ability than Zola and Maupassant and in such a way as to obliterate the line of demarcation between the pontiff and the pornographer (Charles-Henry Hirsch, Charles-Louis Philippe). Another fashion, encouraged by the success of *Quo Vadis* and of Pierre Louÿs's lascivious

Aphrodite, has been the composition of stories of antiquity which, under the excuse of artistic reconstruction, replace the Romantic morbidness of René and Mignon by decadent vices, Antinous and Latin orgies, or exotic and curious loves (Félicien Champsaur, Jane de la Vaudère). A more praiseworthy tendency has been the movement of "regionalism," a feeling that the life of Paris is not the only interesting one, and a desire to depict provincial life and local scenes. This continues the tendencies, though not the immediate influence of great masters like Ferdinand Fabre (René Bazin, Henry Bordeaux).

A distinct tendency seems traceable among certain writers, though often indirectly as much as by immediate contact, to the influence of Nietzsche. His writings were known early in France, at least by hearsay, and some of his books were soon translated and published by the firm of the *Mercure de France*, which caters to the non-academic in taste. Moreover, the anti-moralism of Nietzsche was, in a way, akin to the scorn of philistine conventions of the Romanticists of 1830, and appealed to those in the line of filiation from them.

Another Romantic tendency has had a recrudescence since the vogue of Tolstoy and the Russian novelists: a sympathetic emotionality and sensibility, sometimes carried to an extreme, as when Charles-Louis Philippe is led to call a woman of the street a "pauvre petite sainte." Add to this the not uncommon analysis of emotions, whether violent and overriding law and restraint, or testifying to lack of will power. This may take the form either of purported confessions or of technical novels (André Gide, Emile Clermont in *Amour promis*). So it may be seen that the lineage of Rousseau, Benjamin Constant, Senancour, Amiel, has its representatives today.

The great difference between Romanticism and the neo-Romanticism of the twentieth century lies in the literary setting. Mediævalism is, of course, dead and is replaced by pictures of modern life in often sordid and vicious environments. This is

partly the result of the passage through literature of the Naturalists.

Perhaps the most marked feature of the decade in literature has been the pre-emption of fiction and poetry by women. Into these fields they have carried an intense emotionality and subjectivity (Comtesse de Noailles). The reaction against restraint, a form of the modern emancipation of French women, has led some of them to extraordinary results, and the work of women has included surprising examples of internal and external nudity (Myriam Harry, Lucie Delarue-Mardrus, Rachilde, Renée Vivien).[1]

Women have done little of consequence in the drama, which in spite of the increasing competition of *cafés-concerts* and music-halls, affords the chief outlet for the talent and ingenuity of French writers. In this *genre*, again, one fails to detect a new literature. The greatest success of the generation, *Cyrano de Bergerac* (1897), was soon shown by Jules Lemaître to be, on the contrary, a return to old-fashioned *procédés*. Clever writers of clever plays have been numerous, but as yet neither an Augier nor a Dumas *fils* has shown himself. Many of the writers have treated social problems, as the novelists have done (socialism,

[1] Lest this appreciation of contemporary literature be deemed unfavorable and marked by what the French call "exotic judgment," it may not be amiss to quote the literary journalist and reviewer of books for *le Temps*, M. Gaston Deschamps, on modern new works. Subjects: "La débauche d'égoïsme, d'ibsénisme, de nietzschéisme, de neurasthénie, d'aboulie, et si j'ose m'exprimer ainsi, de 'maboulisme' [*imbecility*] qui envahit les salons et les ateliers, la ville et le théâtre, la vie et les livres." — Characters: "La catégorie des impulsifs, des fous dangereux, des voleurs incohérents, des faussaires incoercibles, des banqueroutiers détraqués, des politiciens dévoyés ou des impétueux érotomanes dont la littérature d'imagination a véritablement abusé dans ces dernières années." (*Le Temps*, March 5, 1911). M. Deschamps's critical judgments are sometimes derided as superficial, but we have here a statement of fact. It is a crying shame that, with so many good things in their land to write about, the French should persist in injuring themselves in their own eyes and in those of foreigners, when they are often borrowing from foreigners in so doing.

clericalism, finance, race antagonism, the relation of the sexes), and with the greater vividness which the stage permits. Yet so far as plot or psychology are concerned, they have given few new topics: the husband, wife and lover (the convention of *bourgeois* adultery) are as popular as in the days of the mediæval *fabliaux*, and the climaxes are apt to be clever *truquage*.

If we try to analyse the significance of the contemporary French drama we find that, aside from the smaller poetic current (Rostand, Rivoire, Zamacoïs), there are at least four tendencies: the social, the selfish, the morbid or neurotic, and the humorous or ironical. The first came into new vogue after the passing of Naturalism at the Théâtre-Libre, when Antoine turned to foreign writers and Paul Fort and Lugné-Poé founded the Théâtre de l'Œuvre. Symbolism had its period on the stage; Hauptmann, Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky became familiar names, and philosophical, moral, social, and psychological ideas were more than ever developed in the actors' tirades: Brieux and Paul Hervieu in the first rank, Emile Fabre and others in a second, have shown how inefficient human laws jolt in their workings and how unkind human nature causes suffering to others. This is the theatre which René Doumic designates as the "théâtre de prédication sociale." The selfish play is the modern equivalent of the Romantic rebellion against society. Assuming to be up to date by invoking Nietzsche, it passes over the Baudelairian pose of the last generation of being bold and bad in order to shock convention, and goes back, by means of the superman, above convention and better than society, to declamations reminding us of an exaggerated George Sand in favor of free love and the "droit au bonheur" (Pierre Wolff in *le Lys*, Romain Coolus in *l'Enfant chérie* etc.). The neurotic play serves no purpose except by dwelling on vicious instincts, to make life appear gloomy and human nature foul (Bataille, Bernstein, Mirbeau).[1] These last two groups comprise what has

[1] "Et l'auteur dramatique sait que la passion, l'ambition, la jalousie, l'envie, la soif du lucre, forment les ressorts éternels de l'activité humaine,

been termed the "théâtre mufle," a *mufle* signifying a cad. Finally, the ironical play ranges from good-natured satire of the times sprinkled with the latest Parisianisms, to the "moral nihilism" of some of Lavedan's comedies.

que les puretés et les noblesses mènent tout droit à la béatitude et qu'un être lilial et contemplatif ferait un fichu personnage au théâtre." — H. Bernstein, quoted by A. Brisson in *le Théâtre*, deuxième série.

CHAPTER II

THE WRITERS

A SATISFACTORY classification of contemporary authors seems impracticable, and it is better to present them in alphabetical order. Nor can any list be exhaustive or satisfy everybody. The names comprised in the present chapter are, with some exceptions, chiefly confined to the novelists, the dramatists and the poets. All the members of the Academy have been included *honoris causa*, though it is well to remember that a fair percentage of the present Academicians are not primarily men of letters.[1]

ADAM, PAUL (b. 1862). Originally a naturalistic novelist, condemned to fine and imprisonment in 1885 for *Chair molle*. Then he became a symbolist and was connected with symbolist reviews, *le Symboliste*, *la Vogue*, *la Revue indépendante*. Since the decline of Symbolism he has written all kinds of miscellaneous stories. Paul Adam is a chaotic, frenzied and voluptuous, as well as a prolific, writer. He has great wealth of imagination and richness of imagery. He not long since visited America, discovering it, as somebody said, like a "Christophe Colomb pressé." Among his many works are *le Mystère des foules*, *la Force*, *Basile*

[1] It must be borne in mind that the scale of treatment, in this chapter, is out of proportion to the rest of the book. Many authors, now in the public eye, will be forgotten as soon as dead, just as others are constantly springing into notice. It has not been deemed necessary to include writers who have earned a season's renown only, by winning one of the numerous prizes awarded in the French literary world. The inclusion of many obviously second-rate authors is justified in that they are often among the first met by the inquisitive foreigner.

et Sophia, *l'Enfant d'Austerlitz*, *Vues d'Amérique*, *le Trust*, *le Rail du Sauveur*.

AICARD, JEAN (b. 1848). Member of the Academy; a southern poet and novelist, fond of writing about Provence. His most famous play, *le Père Lebonnard*, won celebrity when taken up by the Italian actor Novelli. His novels include *le Roi de Camargue*, *le Pavé d'Amour*, *Notre-Dame d'Amour*. His recent stories, *Maurin des Maures* and *l'Illustre Maurin*, are humorous pictures of meridional character, something in the spirit of Daudet's *Tartarin*.

ALLAIS, ALPHONSE (1855–1905). Probably the most noted professional humorist of his day.

ANCEY, GEORGES, pseudonym for Georges Mathiron de Curnieu (b. 1860). A dramatist who began at the Théâtre-Libre a cruel satirist. His best-known play, *Ces Messieurs*, portrays the underhanded influence of the clergy. Other works include: *Monsieur Lamblin*, *l'Ecole des veufs*, *les Inséparables*, *Grand'-mère*, *la Dupe*, *l'Avenir*, *Athènes couronnée de violettes*.

ANGELLIER, AUGUSTE (1848–1911). A poet much admired in academic circles, and himself a professor at Lille; author of an important prose study of Robert Burns.

BARRÈS, MAURICE (b. 1862). Member of the Academy. A writer who has undergone several transformations. He began among the groups of Latin Quarter "posers" including Moréas and Laurent Tailhade. Under the influence of Renan's dilettanteism and Taine's deterministic psychology and of a certain Romantic emotionalism, he took up at first the attitude of the intellectual aristocrat and egotist, which has been called Barresism. This was a cult of self, which also included a delight in self-torture with emotional pin pricks. But, a native of Lorraine, Barrès has always had a sentiment of patriotism made more intense at the sight of the lost provinces; so that, gradually taking up politics, he became a defender of "la tradition française," a regionalist, a "professeur d'énergie." He was also a "nationalist," being one of the first to use the term, and an

anti-Dreyfusite. The unifying principle of his thought has, therefore, been termed Nationalism, defined as reaction against foreign barbarians, against foreigners in the social order, against barbarians in the intellectual life. To the Anglo-Saxon mind Barrès bases his reasons too much on general principles to make them easily applicable to contingencies and become a ready guide. His works include: *Sous l'œil des Barbares*, *Un homme libre*, *le Jardin de Bérénice*, *Huit jours chez M. Renan*, *Une journée parlementaire* (play), *Du sang, de la volupté et de la mort*, *les Déracinés*, *l'Appel au soldat*, *Scènes et doctrines du nationalisme*, *Au service de l'Allemagne*, *le Voyage de Sparte*, *Colette Baudoche*.

BATAILLE, FRÉDÉRIC (b. 1850). Poet and professor in a *lycée*, who began as a village schoolmaster; writes particularly about family and academic virtues.

BATAILLE, HENRI (b. 1872). A dramatist of the ultra-decadent and morbid character, one of those influenced by Ibsen. He has great skill with lulling phraseology (he began with poetry), and a gift of psychological analysis, but he devotes his talent largely to unhealthy emotions, to subtile playings upon what is perverted without being openly indecent. Bataille is *troublant*. His chief plays are, *Maman Colibri*, *la Marche nuptiale*, *Poliche*, *la Femme nue*, *le Scandale*, *la Vierge folle*.

BAZIN, RENÉ (b. 1853). Member of the Academy. A novelist, particularly of provincial and rustic life. He began to write with a conscious desire to react against the brutal Naturalism in vogue at the time, and he has sometimes treated tragedies as great as those of the naturalists without overstepping reserve. Bazin has not, however, sought the artificial idealism of George Sand's country stories, but has remained a realist. Occasionally he is unduly biassed by his Catholicism, and, once or twice, he verges on the namby-pamby. His novel, *la Terre qui meurt*, describing the migration from the land to the cities, is one of the best works of contemporary French fiction. Other important stories of René Bazin are : *Ma tante Giron*, *Une tache d'encre*, *les Noellet*, *la Sarcelle bleue*, *Madame Corentine*, *De toute son*

âme, *les Oberlé* (the consequences to the Alsatians of the Franco-Prussian war), *Donatienne* (the downfall of a peasant woman transplanted to Paris), *l'Isolée* (on the religious question and the expulsion of the nuns), *le Blé qui lève*. M. Bazin has written descriptions of travel in southern Europe.

BEAUNIER, ANDRÉ (b. 1869). A journalist, critic, and novelist. Among his works may be mentioned: *les Dupont-Leterrier* (a story dealing with the Dreyfus case), *la Poésie nouvelle*, *le Roi Tobol*.

BÉRENGER, HENRY (b. 1867). Novelist (*l'Effort* and *la Proie*), journalist and moralist, belonging to the group of free-thinkers. Author of *l'Ame moderne*, *l'Aristocratie intellectuelle*, *la Conscience nationale*, *la France intellectuelle*.

BERGERAT, EMILE (b. 1845). Son-in-law of Théophile Gautier; novelist, dramatist, critic, poet (Banvillesque) and journalist (under the name of "Caliban" in the *Figaro*). Among his best-known plays are: *la Nuit bergamasque*, *Plus que Reine*, *la Pompadour*, a dramatisation of *le Capitaine Fracasse*.

BERNARD, TRISTAN, assumed name of Paul Bernard (b. 1866). Humorous and sometimes sardonic satirist of modern life; writer of stories such as the *Mémoires d'un jeune homme rangé*, but especially of uproarious farces and comedies, such as *l'Anglais tel qu'on le parle*, *Daisy* and *Triplepatte*.

BERNSTEIN, HENRY (b. 1876). A brilliant dramatic author, belonging to the same generation as Bataille; but where Bataille prefers the insidious method, Bernstein likes violent and claptrap, sometimes brutal, ways of shaking the spectator's nerves. He is as pessimistic as Bataille and as fond of wallowing in vice. Adolphe Brisson characterises his plays thus: "Pas un rayon de soleil sur ce fumier; dans ce cloaque, pas une fleur: ni la fleur de l'idéal, ni la fleur du sacrifice; partout le morne assouvissement des appétits, le rut sans allégresse, la mort, le néant." His chief plays are *le Détour*, *le Bercail*, *la Rafale*, *la Griffe*, *le Voleur*, *Samson*, *Israël*, *Après moi*.

BERTHEROY, MME JEAN, pseudonym of Mme Berthe-Corinne

Le Barillier (b. 1860). Authoress of historical novels of ancient life, vaguely reminding one of Bulwer's *Last Days of Pompeii*, but with a lyrical and flowery touch; *la Danseuse de Pompéi, la Beauté d'Alcias, les Vierges de Syracuse, les Délices de Mantoue, le Colosse de Rhodes, le Mime Bathylle.*

BERTRAND, Louis (b. 1866). A professor and novelist. His writings include: *la Fin du classicisme et le retour à l'antique*, and stories such as *Pépète le bien-aimé* and *l'Invasion.*

BISSON, ALEXANDRE (b. 1848). Author of exhilarating farces and vaudevilles, and of melodramas. Among his most successful light plays are *le Député de Bombignac, les Surprises du divorce, la Famille Pont-Biquet, le Contrôleur des wagons-lits*, to which may be added the emotional melodrama *la Femme X . . .*

BLÉMONT, EMILE (b. 1839). Early Parnassian poet and critic; has also written dramatic trifles. One of those who introduced Whitman and Longfellow to France.

BOIS, JULES (b. 1870). Novelist, dramatist, student of occultism and psychic manifestations; author of studies on *le Satanisme et la magie.* His most ambitious play, *la Furie*, in pedestrian verse, is a peculiar attempt to modernise Euripides and Seneca, by depicting a prehistoric Hercules *furens* influenced by occultism and magnetism, as well as by twentieth-century political theories.

BONNARD, ABEL (b. 1883). Poet, author of *les Familiers*, verses about animals.

BORDEAUX, HENRY (b. 1870). Critic and novelist. In criticism a pupil of Bourget and of Taine, fond of psychological analysis. As novelist a psychologist as well, but not a describer of bric-à-brac, too, like the psychologist Bourget; a realist who has avoided pornography and the neurotics of Parisianism; fond of narrating lives and characters of his native Savoy in a calm manner, which the boulevard critic is apt to term heavy and provincial. None the less, a writer of distinction. Chief volumes of criticism: *Ames modernes, les Ecrivains et les mœurs;* chief novels: *le Pays natal, la Vie sans retour, la Peur de vivre,*

l'Amour en fuite, le Lac noir, la Petite Mademoiselle, les Roquevillard, les Yeux qui s'ouvrent, la Robe de laine, la Neige sur les pas.

BOTREL, THÉODORE (b. 1868). A poet of Brittany.

BOUCHOR, MAURICE (b. 1855). A former adept in the Richepin method of scandalising (*Chansons joyeuses*), later an idealist and a symbolist, a sort of mystic pantheist and exponent of views set forth in religious "mysteries" and poems; now devotes himself to social work in popularising literature among the working classes, and to the encouragement of popular or folk poetry itself.

BOUHÉLIER, SAINT-GEORGES DE (Georges de Bouhélier-Lepelletier) (b. 1876). Poet, critic and dramatist. Founder of the "mouvement naturiste" of emotion instead of observation, as with the naturalist; it is a kind of pantheism of the modern world, expressive of the "hieroglyphic significance" of men's doings and the "divine action" in which each one participates. This wordy programme of an immature rhetorician simmered down in time to a more definite theory: Saint-Georges de Bouhélier desires to show the unappreciated hero in the toils of every-day existence, to treat the gloom of life's tragedies in the tone of mysticism, with effects of heightened contrasts. His early plays were vague and indistinct in their symbolism; the later ones are pessimistic, reflecting the general spirit of Ibsen, but have become more lucid: *le Roi sans couronne, la Tragédie royale, le Carnaval des enfants.* He combines elements of Realism Romanticism and Symbolism.

BOUKAY, MAURICE, pseudonym of Maurice Couyba (b. 1866). Poet and composer of songs, professor, writer on art and æsthetics, politician.

BOURGES, ELÉMIR (b. 1852). Member of the Goncourt Academy. Pessimistic novelist: *le Crépuscule des dieux, Sous la hache, les Oiseaux s'envolent et les fleurs tombent, la Nef, etc.*

BOURGET, PAUL (b. 1852). Member of the Academy. Originally a pessimistic unbeliever, now a Catholic. He first made his reputation as a critic in the *Essais de psychologie contemp-*

oraine, in which he adapted to his uses the scientific method of Claude Bernard and Taine, and analysed in typical representatives of literature the characteristic tendencies of the second half of the nineteenth century, such as pessimism, dilettanteism, cosmopolitanism (*Essais* and *Nouveaux essais de littérature contemporaine*). His mind was kept awake not merely by study, but by travel in Italy (*Sensations d'Italie*), England (*Etudes anglaises*) and America (*Outre-mer*). As a novelist he has applied the same method of analysis and of character portrayal, harking back to Stendhal as a master. He developed the psychological novel of inner description, as opposed to the realistic or naturalistic novel of outward description, and is often compared to Henry James. Indeed, the two occupy a somewhat similar position. But Paul Bourget's novels deal very largely with the topic of adulterous love, and he likes to place his characters in elegant or "smart" social sets of Europe, or to unfold his plots in fashionable drawing-rooms or in *garçonnières* full of expensive furniture. Thus he has developed a literary fastidiousness of style and intrigue which his admirers call *aristocratisme*, and his detractors Renanian dilettanteism or *snobisme;* which word, however, does not always have the English sense, but often implies mainly the cultivation of new social fads. Paul Bourget desires pre-eminently to be the moralist of the Faubourg Saint-Germain and of Catholicism and the anti-revolutionary spirit, implying in the term "moralist" a psychological analysis of morals rather than their judgment. His numerous novels include: *Cruelle énigme*, *Un crime d'amour*, *André Cornélis*, *le Disciple*, *l'Emigré*, *Un cœur de femme*, *la Terre promise*, *Cosmopolis*, *Un scrupule*, *Une idylle tragique*, *l'Etape*. Paul Bourget has also written some plays, such as *la Barricade*, *le Tribun*, which deal with the menaces of socialism and of trades-unions, etc.

BOUTELLEAU, GEORGES (b. 1846). Journalist, poet, story writer and author of plays.

BOUTROUX, EMILE (b. 1845). One of the leading philosophers

of today. His chief works are *De la contingence des lois de la nature* and *De l'idée de loi naturelle dans la science et la philosophie contemporaines*. His important theory is that contingency is at the bottom of nature, that the necessity of natural laws is relative, that in nature there are stages or degrees, in each of which a new element is added to the previous stage: life to matter, consciousness to life, etc. The second work classifies the laws in a relative hierarchy. Though an empiricist, M. Boutroux is not a determinist.

BOYLESVE, RENÉ (b. 1867). A minor novelist, often of provincial life; author of *le Bel avenir*, *Mon amour*.

BRIEUX, EUGÈNE (b. 1858). Member of the Academy. An intensely serious dramatist who takes up in succession vices and defects of contemporary civilisation and presents them in a heavy yet vigorous manner: political corruption, judicial influence, divorce, gambling, neglect of children, even sexual disease, etc. *La Robe rouge*, on French legal procedure and magisterial ambitions, is one of the strongest modern plays. Other important ones are: *Blanchette*, *l'Engrenage*, *l'Evasion*, *les Trois filles de M. Dupont*, *les Avariés*, *le Berceau*, *Résultat des courses*, *les Remplaçantes*, *les Hannetons*, *la Française*, *Simone*, *la Foi*.

BRISSON, ADOLPHE (b. 1863). Dramatic critic of *le Temps*, successor of his father-in-law Francisque Sarcey, and of Gustave Larroumet.

CAILLAVET, GASTON-ARMAND DE (b. 1869), and ROBERT DE FLERS (b. 1872) are inseparable collaborators of numerous successful comedies for the contemporary stage, among which are to be mentioned *l'Amour veille*, *le Roi* (a satire on modern Parisian manners and democratic politics), *l'Ane de Buridan*, *le Bois sacré*, *Papa*.

CAPUS, ALFRED (b. 1858). A novelist, and more especially an author of plays of witty Parisianism, sometimes a little off-color, but without the vicious pessimism of certain of his contemporaries. His works, plays and stories, include: *Qui perd gagne*, *la Bourse ou la vie*, *la Veine*, *les Deux écoles*, *la Châtelaine*,

Notre jeunesse, l'Adversaire (with Emmanuel Arène), *Brignol et sa fille, Monsieur Piégois, l'Attentat, les Passagères, les Deux hommes, l'Oiseau blessé, Un ange, Robinson.*

CHANTAVOINE, HENRI (b. 1850). Professor of French literature, poet and literary critic.

CHARMES, FRANCIS (b. 1848). Member of the Academy. Publicist, politician and journalist; successor of Brunetière as editor of the *Revue des Deux-Mondes.*

CLARETIE, JULES (b. 1840). Member of the Academy. Prolific journalist, novelist, dramatist and miscellaneous writer; director of the Théâtre-Français.

CLAUDEL, PAUL (b. 1868). An author of comments of travel and of unacted dramas much admired by some of the inner set of the *Mercure de France.*

COCHIN, DENYS (b. 1851). Member of the Academy. Politician and writer on scientific subjects: he has been a partisan of Pasteur against the theories of Herbert Spencer and has published collections of his speeches, particularly on foreign relations.

COOLUS, ROMAIN, pseudonym of René Weil (b. 1868). A successful dramatist belonging to the "théâtre amoral," with such plays as *l'Enfant chérie, Une femme passa,* and *les Bleus de l'amour.*

COULEVAIN, PIERRE DE, pseudonym of Hélène Favre de Coulevain. A cosmopolitan authoress fond of describing English and American life, or, in *Sur la branche,* the woman without a home who wanders "on the wing" through Europe, observing the world and commenting on its ways: *Noblesse américaine, Ève victorieuse, Sur la branche, l'Ile inconnue* (England).

COURTELINE, GEORGES, pseudonym of Georges Moinaux (b. 1861). A writer of humorous stories, often of military life, and short grotesque comedies verging on buffoonery, but which embody the ridiculous side that the French *bourgeoisie* likes to laugh at in itself. Among his works are: *Un Client sérieux, les Gaîtés de l'Escadron, le Train de 8 heures 47, les Ronds de cuir,*

Boubouroche (the most admired), *la Paix du ménage*, *la Conversion d'Alceste* (more serious).

CROISSET, FRANCIS DE, pseudonym of F. Wiener (b. 1877). A Belgian by birth, author of miscellaneous plays, one of which, *Chérubin*, in verse, caused much scandal and was withdrawn from the Théâtre-Français after the general rehearsal.

CUREL, FRANÇOIS DE (b. 1854). A dramatist who began at the Théâtre-Libre, and has never been a widely popular writer. His ideas have become more abstract with the progress of time and his "philosophy" is inconclusive. He is versed in Crébillon-like horrors of fear and passion modernised to a nineteenth or twentieth-century taste in psychology. His plays are frequently unpleasant, and the impression produced is chaotic, yet none the less, he is an author not to be made light of. His plays include: *l'Envers d'une sainte*, *l'Invitée*, *l'Amour brode*, *la Figurante*, *le Repas du lion*, *la Nouvelle idole*, *les Fossiles*, *la Fille sauvage*, *le Coup d'aile*.

DAUDET, MME ALPHONSE (Julia Allard), has written verses, criticism and recollections of her husband.

DAUDET, ERNEST (b. 1837). Brother of Alphonse Daudet; novelist, historian and, to a minor degree, dramatist and journalist.

DAUDET, LÉON (b. 1868). Son of Alphonse Daudet: novelist (*les Kamtchatka*, *les Morticoles*, *le Voyage de Shakespeare*), and nationalist-royalist journalist.

DECOURCELLE, PIERRE (b. 1856). Author of numerous novels and melodramas, such as *les Deux gosses*.

DELARUE-MARDRUS, MME LUCIE (b. 1880). Poetess and novelist characterised by a liberal moral *décolletage*. Many of her novels and poems deal with the life of the rustics and fishermen of her native Normandy and the coast near Honfleur.

DELBOUSQUET, EMMANUEL (1874–1909). A member of the so-called group of Toulouse; poet of the Landes of southern France.

DÉROULÈDE, PAUL (b. 1846). Nephew of Emile Augier and

great-grandson of Pigault-Lebrun; author of military poems, such as the *Chants du soldat* and *Poésies militaires*; took an active part in politics during and after the Dreyfus case, and was in exile for five years (1900–1905). He is an instance of the dramatic though sincere patriot, always conscious of effect and straining after display; a good sample of the Cornelian character transplanted to nineteenth-century real life.

DESCAVES, LUCIEN (b. 1861). A writer of considerable talent, who, like a number of his contemporaries, won his first success by a novel which raised a scandal. Descaves was a follower of Huysmans, but signed the manifesto of the "Five" against Zola. Shortly after, he published *Sous-Offs*, which brought about a storm, not only by its pictures of vice, but because it was charged with being an attack on the army. His play at the Théâtre-Libre, *les Chapons*, depicting the selfishness of two *bourgeois* during the Prussian war, raised a similar storm in the Senate. Descaves's best work has been done in collaboration with Maurice Donnay, and *la Clairière*, on the futility of communistic experiments, deserves high praise. *Oiseaux de passage* deals with the life of Russian agitators in Paris.

DESCHANEL, PAUL (b. 1856). Member of the Academy. Publicist and politician, orator and author of books on public affairs.

DESJARDINS, PAUL (b. 1859). Writer on morals (*le Devoir présent*, etc.); founder of societies for ethical culture, and the discussion of contemporary questions. A neo-Christian individualist.

DESPAX, EMILE (b. 1881). An elegiac, romantic and symbolic poet, author of *la Maison des glycines*.

DIERX, LÉON (b. 1838). A Parnassian, coming, like Leconte de Lisle, from the île de la Réunion; quiet, dignified, and unobtrusive in style; was elected by his fellow-writers "prince of poets," on the death of Stéphane Mallarmé.

DONNAY, MAURICE (b. 1860). Member of the Academy. Beginning his career at the bohemian *Chat noir* he has won a

seat under the cupola of the Institute. His early writings were the quintessence of Parisian *esprit*, what has been called the Hellenism of Montmartre, but it is the Hellenism of Phryne and Lysistrata and not of Sophocles or Plato. As befits his rise in dignity, Donnay's later plays have been more serious. His numerous writings include: *Phryné*, "le Chat noir à Athènes," irreverently dedicated to the "late Patin," who was the type of the conventional classical pedagogue; *Chères mesdames* (dialogues); *Lysistrata*, *Amants*, *Douloureuse*, *l' Affranchie*, *le Torrent*, *Education de prince*, *la Bascule*, *l'Autre danger*, *le Retour de Jérusalem* (containing a caricature of Max Nordau), *la Patronne*, *Paraître*. *La Clairière* was written in conjunction with Descaves.

DORCHAIN, AUGUSTE (b. 1857). Poet and dramatist, very successful in winning academic recompenses; a delicate and graceful sentimentalist; author of *la Jeunesse pensive* and *Vers la lumière*. His chief plays are *Conte d'avril*, inspired by *Twelfth Night*, *Rose d'automne* and *Pour l'amour*.

DOUMIC, RENÉ (b. 1860). Member of the Academy. Literary historian and critic and author of numerous volumes on miscellaneous writers and dramatists. A faithful contributor to the *Revue des Deux-Mondes* where, particularly under the Brunetière régime, he maintained the solemn standard of that periodical. M. Doumic is a conservative in literature and in religion, but he is, taken as a whole, one of the more profitable guides to French literature for a foreigner, because of his directness of interpretation and freedom from fuss and feathers. Among his works are a history of French literature. *Portraits d'écrivains*, *De Scribe à Ibsen*, *Ecrivains d'aujourd'hui*, *les Jeunes*. *Essais sur le théâtre contemporain*, *Etudes sur la littérature française*, *le Théâtre nouveau*.

DUCHESNE, MGR LOUIS-MARIE-OLIVIER (b. 1843). Member of the Academy. Director of the French Archæological School at Rome; writer on early church history; one of the writers who have gone near the verge of modernism yet have managed to keep their skirts clear; author of a critical edition of the *Liber*

pontificalis, and of works on the early history of the Catholic church (*Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*).

ERNEST-CHARLES, JEAN (b. 1875). Journalist, literary and dramatic critic; expresses himself in a very self-conscious style.

ESPARBÈS, GEORGES D' (b. 1864). Author of military and warfaring novels and stories of which the scenes are placed in different ages: *la Légende de l'aigle*, *la Guerre en dentelles*, *le Tumulte*, etc.

ESTAUNIÉ, EDOUARD (b. 1862). Novelist, author of *l'Empreinte* (the best), depicting the influence of the education of the Jesuits, *la Vie secrète*, etc.

FABIÉ, FRANÇOIS (b. 1846). Poet of local and rustic life, particularly of his native Rouergue.

FABRE, EMILE (b. 1870). Vigorous and talented dramatist, fond of portraying on the stage the movement of crowds and the confusion of multitudes. His plots usually turn on the corrupting influence of politics and money. His chief plays are: *Comme ils sont tous*, *l'Argent*, *la Vie publique*, *les Ventres dorés*, *la Maison d'argile*, *Timon d'Athènes*, *les Vainqueurs*. He has dramatised Balzac: *la Rabouilleuse*, *César Birotteau*.

FAGUET, EMILE (b. 1847). Member of the Academy. One of the important contemporary critics and a professor at the Sorbonne. He belongs by inheritance and training to the educational profession, and wrote a thesis for the doctorate on French tragedy in the sixteenth century. He has published excellent literary studies on the authors of the last four centuries, and particularly three volumes on the *Politiques et moralistes du XIXe siècle*, as well as monographs on individual authors, and a brief history of French literature. Even this list is very far from exhausting M. Faguet's activities, inasmuch as he has written dramatic criticisms, and pours forth a continuous stream of lectures, essays and books on every describable topic, literary and otherwise, from Plato or Nietzsche to anti-clericalism and the ten commandments. M. Faguet is one of the most fertile writers in modern French literature, and one of the most abund-

ant in suggestions; though he seems averse to dogmatism or undue system and the postulation of all-embracing ideas. He prefers the study of individuals and his sympathies incline towards the seventeenth and the nineteenth centuries. His method is usually interpretation, which he even carries to the extent of constructive criticism: he likes to imagine what an author would have said, if he had written on this or that subject. As a result, M. Faguet is an illuminating, and yet not always intelligible, guide: the reader is often at a loss to know whether the critic is interpreting what the author in question did say, or what he might have said. Add a tendency to be occasionally paradoxical, in order to discover or bring out a hitherto unobserved phase, and a somewhat careless and even slangy style, enlivened by epigrammatic characterisations, and one begins to realise the merits and demerits of M. Faguet. He must count as one of the most "necessary" critics to the student of French literature, but as one who, through excessive and unconsidered writing, often imparts insignificant information and whose criticism runs the danger of becoming only clever chatter.

FARRÈRE, CLAUDE, pseudonym of Frédéric Bargone (b. 1876). A naval officer and imitator of Loti's exotic stories, with greater violence of plot. His chief novel is *les Civilisés*.

FAUCHOIS, RENÉ (b. 1882). A dramatic writer, author of *Beethoven* and of *la Fille de Pilate*, a "modern style" religious play, in which Pilate's daughter falls in love with Jesus and undergoes sympathetic convulsions as he experiences his Passion. (Compare the mysticism of St. Theresa in Catulle Mendès's *la Vierge d'Avila*.)

FEYDEAU, GEORGES (b. 1862). Son of Ernest Feydeau and author of innumerable off-color but highly successful vaudeville-farces, belonging to the *répertoire* of theatres, such as the Nouveautés: *Champignol malgré lui*, *l'Hôtel du libre-échange*, *la Dame de chez Maxim*, *Occupe-toi d'Amélie*, etc.

FLERS, ROBERT de. Cf. CAILLAVET.

FORT, PAUL (b. 1872). Author of *Ballades françaises* in

rhythmic prose, or which, even if rhymed or assonanced, are not divided into stanzaic form; one of the most effective results of the *vers libre* movement, though the verse runs into prose.

FOUILLÉE, ALFRED (b. 1838). A philosopher who aims to make morals enter into positive science, by the theory of "idées-forces," which considers ideas as having an active force instead of being in themselves inert. His theories are in part influenced by the study of Plato. He has also written on national morals and psychology.

FRANCE, ANATOLE, literary name of ANATOLE-FRANÇOIS THIBAULT (b. 1844). Member of the Academy. The chief living prose writer of France. He began his career as a Parnassian minor poet, and as editor of editions or writer of prefaces. The son of a bookseller and brought up among books, he was from the first surrounded by an atmosphere of literature, but when made a librarian of the Senate he probably spent more time on his own reading than on his clerical duties. His first noteworthy success came with *le Crime de Sylvestre Bonnard*, which still remains, at least abroad, his most popular work, the story of a simple old recluse and book-worm and a young orphan, daughter (in later editions, granddaughter) of his former sweetheart. Anatole France is wonderfully successful in recalling sights and scenes of childhood, and the semi-autobiographical *Livre de mon ami* (see also parts of *Pierre Nozière*) is an excellent reconstitution.

But Anatole France did not confine himself to personal literature. A great *fureteur* and browser in the byways of literature, he was fond of seeking plots in unexpected quarters, ranging from the mediæval nun of Gandersheim Hrotsvitha (*Thaïs*) to stories of the Italian Renaissance (*le Puits de Sainte-Claire*), or even modern Florence (*le Lys rouge*). He has never been a great inventor in fiction, and his most characteristic work has been in the shape of reflection or comment. This appears in *le Jardin d'Epicure* and *l'Etui de nacre*, and more especially in two important series of volumes. The first consists of *la Rôtisserie de la reine Pédauque* and *les Opinions de Jérôme Coignard*,

the second is the *Histoire contemporaine*, composed of *l'Orme du mail, le Mannequin d'osier, l'Anneau d'améthyste* and *M. Bergeret à Paris*. In the former, under the influence of the irony of Renan, the sarcasm of Voltaire, and some of the setting of Diderot, Anatole France, in a spirit of jesting and kindly irreverence, represents the adventures of a reprobate and Rabelaisian but semi-philosophical monk and his faithful follower Jacques Tournebroche, interweaving the narrative with quasi-magic and astrology. In the latter series, the publication of which coincided largely with the Dreyfus affair, he represents modern France in the usual spirit of ironical disenchantment. *L'Histoire comique*, dealing with the life of actors, was more bitter; *Crainquebille* (one of the author's best short stories, and giving its title to a collection) and *Sur la Pierre blanche* have a proletarian or socialistic bias. *L'Ile des pingouins* is a new satire of French history in the tone of Voltaire. In the earlier part of his literary career, Anatole France was, for a time, literary critic of *le Temps*, and his criticisms were collected under the title *la Vie littéraire*. More recently he has written a study of Jeanne d'Arc, in which he has rationalised her spiritual experiences in the tone of Renan, to the indignation of the clerical party. The most important of his poetical compositions is *les Noces corinthiennes* which, with the accompanying verses is in the style of Alexandrian Hellenism frequently found among the Parnassians.

Anatole France never cared much for literary criticism, and he made only a fleeting passage through it, being too unsystematic to submit to the routine of journalism. But he must, none the less, be noted as an important example of the dilettante and impressionist critic, the amused observer of passing events, and the chronicler of his own reactions among the works of literature: "Criticism, as I understand it, is like philosophy and history, a kind of novel for the benefit of enlightened and interested minds, and every novel is, rightly considered, an autobiography. The good critic is he who describes the adventures

of his soul among masterpieces. To be frank, the critic should say: 'Gentlemen, I intend to speak of myself about Shakespere, Racine, Pascal, or Goethe.' "

Thus Anatole France is primarily a disciple of Renan, but he intermingled with this attitude the mocking spirit of the eighteenth-century philosophers. Averse to the rough scrambles of ambition, a worshipper of beauty in art and literature, he long remained an intellectual aristocrat, facing life with dissolvent yet not uncharitable criticism. Similarly, different phases of Anatole France himself are seen in the heroes of his novels or imaginary chronicles: Sylvestre Bonnard, the abbé Coignard and M. Bergeret.

An unexpected but, after all, not illogical transformation took place in Anatole France as a result of the Dreyfus case. This fastidious contemner of modern life came forward at once as a partisan of liberty and freedom of speech. He ranged himself among the "intellectuels" who spoke, wrote and fought for justice against persecution, and for the revision of the military condemnation of the Jewish captain. The intellectual anarchist was not to be silenced by browbeating and the glitter of military uniforms. Consequently, he entered the arena as a radical, and his sympathies since then have been with the victims of society or of tradition. This made him join the anti-clericals in the religious controversy preceding the disestablishment of the church, and side with the radicals and socialists.

Anatole France, like the humanists of the past, is steeped in borrowed thought and language. He unconsciously repeats expressions of others; he even plagiarises himself. His lack of constructive ability makes his style in many of his works a loping commentary. Yet in intrinsic grace and easy taste no contemporary French author equals him. He is in this respect the true heir of the great master of style, Renan.

FRAPIÉ, LÉON (b. 1863). Novelist and story writer, whose speciality is the study of the children of the poor and the working classes of Paris. His best known work is *la Maternelle.*

GANDILLOT, LÉON (b. 1862). Author of frisky vaudevilles like those of an emancipated Labiche. *Vers l'amour* is more serious.

GAUTIER, MME JUDITH (b. 1850). The first woman elected to the Goncourt Academy; daughter of Théophile Gautier. Without ever having visited the Orient, she has specialised in exotic subjects. Her chief books are: *le Livre de jade* (prose poems), *le Dragon impérial* (Chinese), *le Marchand de sourires* (Japanese play), *Iskender* (Persian), memoirs called *le Collier des jours*. One of the first partisans in France of Wagner, as was her divorced husband, Catulle Mendès.

GEFFROY, GUSTAVE (b. 1855). Journalist and miscellaneous writer, art critic and traveller. Chief work of fiction: *l'Apprentie*.

GIDE, ANDRÉ (b. 1869). A distinguished though not widely read author; an æsthetic egotist, who has undergone far-ranging influences, drawn from different literatures rather than from life, and ranging from Rousseau to Oscar Wilde and Nietzsche. He scarcely lays claim to being a novelist, and his works are of interest more for the author's attitude than for the plots. The chief ones are: *les Cahiers d'André Walter*, æsthetic and sentimental meditations, *le Voyage d'Urien*; *les Nourritures terrestres*; *l'Immoraliste*, the story of a life turned to the cult of self; *la Porte étroite*, Protestant asceticism; *Isabelle*, a gloomy story of Normandy, in which the hero, drawn like the troubadour Rudel, to an unseen woman, is disenchanted when he meets the reality. Plays: *le Roi Candaule*, *Saül*. Criticisms: *Prétextes*, *Nouveaux prétextes*.

GOURMONT, REMY DE (b. 1858). Paradoxical and cerebral impressionist, dabbler in mysticism, symbolism, occultism, æstheticism. Author of *le Latin mystique*, *Esthétique de la langue française*, *la Culture des idées*, and of critical essays called *le Livre des masques*.

GREGH, FERNAND (b. 1873). A meritorious poet, originally a follower of Verlaine; author of numerous volumes, among which

are *la Maison de l'enfance* and *l'Or des minutes*. In 1902 he tried to start an art of "Humanism," to take the place of the Parnassian chilliness and the symbolistic self-centredness.

GUERNE, VICOMTE DE (b. 1853). A late Parnassian poet; disciple and literary executor of Leconte de Lisle.

GUILLAUMIN, EMILE (b. 1873). Author of stories of rural life, including *la Vie d'un simple*, one of the best descriptions of the dull and uneventful life of a French peasant, written in the first person. Much more can be learned about country life from such a work than from all Zola or George Sand put together.

GUINON, ALBERT (b. 1863). Dramatist. His most noted play, *Décadence*, contrasts the degenerate nobility and the money-making Jews.

GYP, pseudonym of the COMTESSE DE MIRABEAU DE MARTEL (b. 1850). A descendant of Mirabeau-Tonneau, brother of the great Mirabeau; author of smart, slangy stories too numerous to record, suited to the *Vie Parisienne* newspaper, in which the fashionable worldly sets are portrayed.

HANOTAUX, GABRIEL (b. 1853). Member of the Academy. Historian and politician; has written studies of Richelieu and of the third Republic.

HARAUCOURT, EDMOND (b. 1857). Originally a symbolist poet; one of the leaders of the *Hydropathes* in the early eighties. A poet of pessimism, a novelist and writer of plays. Chief poems: *les Vikings* and *le Dix-neuvième siècle*; chief plays: *la Passion*, a "mystery," *Don Juan*, *Jean Bart*.

HARRY, MYRIAM, pseudonym of Mme PERRAULT (b. 1875). Writer of exotic stories and descriptions of the East, the extreme Orient, Tunis, etc. *La Conquête de Jérusalem* is an extremely vigorous and masculine story, permeated with hatred for the chilliness of Protestantism. Some of her later writings are unnecessarily erotic. Mme Myriam Harry was born at Jerusalem of stock partly Polish, partly English, partly German, and partly Jewish.

HAUSSONVILLE, COMTE DE CLÉRON D' (b. 1843). Member of

the Academy. A writer on literary, social, historical, and political topics. He should be distinguished from his father (1809–1884), also a historian and Academician.

HERMANT, ABEL (b. 1862). Novelist and dramatist, much addicted to the malicious wit of the *Vie Parisienne* character, and quite unprincipled in his attitude towards the world. A number of his works are in the form of dialogues, and one of them, *les Transatlantiques*, is an amusing take-off of Americans seen from the French point of view. Many bear the general heading, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la société*, of which *les Grands bourgeois* is perhaps the cleverest, reminding one to a certain extent of Anatole France's *Histoire contemporaine*, though the smartness is more strained. Other works are: *le Cavalier Miserey* (a *succès de scandale*), *Souvenirs du vicomte de Courpière*, *Monsieur de Courpière marié*, *le Cadet de Coutras*, *Trains de luxe* (a companion piece to *les Transatlantiques* on South American nabobs or *rastaquouères*), *les Confidences d'une biche*, *la Biche relancée*. Abel Hermant has little ability in the construction of plots, his talent lying entirely in external observation; hence his plays are generally weak; among them are: *la Meute*, *l'Empreinte*, *l'Esbrouffe*, *les Jacobines*, and dramatisations of some of his works of fiction. He likes to take an incident of current talk or gossip and make it the subject of "novel-memoirs": impecunious French noblemen seeking American heiresses, or anti-masonic agitations and the scandals connected with the career of Syveton, the professor who became politician.

HÉROLD, A.-FERDINAND (b. 1865). Grandson of the composer Hérold; miscellaneous writer and dramatic critic; began as one of the symbolist school; many of his writings are suggested or inspired by his classical or Oriental studies.

HERVIEU, PAUL (b. 1857). Member of the Academy. One of the most serious of French writers. His earlier works, chiefly novels, were ponderous studies of contemporary manners and of their cruelty: *Peints par eux-mêmes*, *l'Armature* (dealing with the influence of money as a "frame-work" of society). His

more recent writings have been plays, belonging to the category of problem plays. They are technically well constructed and every word tells, but they are painfully gloomy pictures of life and vigorous attacks on the injustice of the laws which govern society. Paul Hervieu is usually the advocate of woman. *Les Tenailles* shows the misery of a couple linked together in unhappy marriage; *la Loi de l'homme* also portrays the injustice of the marriage law; *la Course au flambeau* ("quasi cursores vitaî lampada tradunt"), his masterpiece, shows each generation of humanity sacrificed to the selfish one which follows. Other plays are: *les Paroles restent, l'Enigme, le Dédale, le Réveil, Théroigne de Méricourt, Connais-toi.*

HOUSSAYE, HENRY (1848–1911). Member of the Academy. Son of Arsène Houssaye; writer on Greek art and history, on the Napoleonic era, miscellaneous essayist.

HOUVILLE, GÉRARD D', pseudonym of MME HENRI DE RÉGNIER (b. 1875). Daughter of José-Maria de Heredia; poetess and novelist.

HUMIÈRES, ROBERT D', (b. 1868). Poet, translator from the English, theatrical director and author of plays of a bloody and sensual character, such as *la Marquesita.*

JAMMES, FRANCIS (b. 1868). Poet of southern France, advocate of a return to nature; expresses himself, in his attempts to be simple, in a rather eccentric form.

KISTEMAECKERS, HENRY (b. 1872). A successful writer of fiction and dramatist of Belgian origin, whose works have not any marked individuality.

LAFENESTRE, GEORGES (b. 1837). Curator at the Louvre, professor at the Collège de France, Parnassian poet, writer on art, author of monographs on La Fontaine, Molière.

LAMY, ETIENNE (b. 1845). Member of the Academy. Historian and formerly a deputy in the early days of the third Republic; a Catholic republican, and sometime editor of *le Correspondant.* His chief works have been studies of the second Empire and of France in the Orient.

d. 1912

LANGLOIS, HIPPOLYTE (b. 1839). Member of the Academy. French general, and writer on military questions.

LANSON, GUSTAVE (b. 1857). Professor of French literature at the Sorbonne and, since the death of Brunetière, the chief influence in France in directing the work of students in French literature. His method is now essentially one of historical and bibliographical research (cf. p. 839), and he enunciates the dictum that the best way to begin the study of literature is to ponder over the studies in historical method of C.-V. Langlois, the historian, of MM. Seignobos and Monod. In addition to his history of French literature, he has written studies of Nivelle de la Chaussée, Bossuet, Boileau, Corneille, Voltaire, and various volumes of miscellaneous studies, among which one of the most suggestive is *l'Art de la prose.*

LAVEDAN, HENRI (b. 1859). Member of the Academy. An author, chiefly of humorously cynical pictures of Parisian life, especially among the fast set and those who live only for sport and enjoyment. On the other hand, he has written some serious and moralising plays. To the first category belong especially *le Nouveau jeu* and *le Vieux marcheur*, "romans dialogués," the dramatisations of the same works, as well as *le Prince d'Aurec*, *Viveurs*, *le Marquis de Priola* (the aristocratic libertine and modern Don Juan). Different are *Catherine*, *Varennes* (historical drama in collaboration with G. Lenôtre), *le Duel* and *le Goût du vice*. *Le Duel* is Lavedan's masterpiece and represents the struggle between two brothers, one an atheist physician, the other a priest, to obtain control of a woman who has confided to the priest the love by which she is drawn to the other brother. Lavedan's works are extremely clever.

LAVISSE, ERNEST (b. 1842). Member of the Academy. Historian and professor; editor of important co-operative histories of Europe and of France, to the latter of which he has contributed a valuable study of the seventeenth century.

LEBLOND, MARIUS (b. 1877) and ARY (b. 1880). Two brothers who always work in collaboration. They come from the Île

de la Réunion, the birthplace of Leconte de Lisle. They are authors of stories and, particularly, of literary and social *enquêtes* or investigations.

LE BRAZ, ANATOLE (b. 1859). Professor at the university of Rennes, poet and student of Breton legends and customs.

LE GOFFIC, CHARLES (b. 1863). Breton poet (*Amour breton*, *le Bois dormant*), novelist (*le Crucifié de Keraliès*, *la Payse*, *Ventôse*, etc.), and critic, as well as author of economic studies and of brief works on versification and modern French literature.

LEMAÎTRE, JULES (b. 1853). Member of the Academy. A *normalien* and professor who has become a general critic and ultra-modern man of letters. His first important work was a thesis on the immediate successors of Molière in French comedy, but his reputation was made by *les Contemporains*, volumes of individual studies of French writers. To these must be added the ten volumes of *Impressions de théâtre*, dramatic criticisms contributed for a number of years to the *Journal des Débats*. M. Lemaître wrote some *contes*, and, at two periods of his career, successful plays: at first, *Revoltée*, *le Député Leveau*, *Mariage blanc*, *Flipote*, *l'Age difficile*, *le Pardon*, *la bonne Hélène*, *l'Aînée*, and more recently *Bertrade* and *la Massière*. For several years M. Lemaître gave up literature to engage in militant politics during the nationalist and anti-Dreyfus campaign. He has since then returned to literature, and has published volumes on Rousseau, Racine, and Fénelon, as an outcome of lectures given on those authors.

M. Lemaître belongs to the school of Renan, and he is characterised by the epithet "impressionist." Particularly in his earlier years he disdained to use literature except to express the reaction upon himself of authors, for the purpose of entertaining readers who might enjoy his cleverness. He is the wittiest of critics, and plays with ideas to such an extent that one is in doubt when to take him seriously. He delights, as in his criticism of *Tartuffe*, to prove one side, and then turn round and prove, with as much conviction, the other side, just to show his

ability as a juggler. Eminently nationalist in spirit as in politics, M. Lemaître represents the literary Frenchman of the most brilliantly inquisitive, but indolent and epicurean type. The Dreyfus agitation, though in some ways an unfortunate episode in his career, has in other respects given a more serious tone to his criticism and a less frivolous pose.

LE ROY, EUGÈNE (1836-1907). One of the few writers who have avoided the notoriety of Paris life. His *Jacquou le Croquant* is an important novel and a reconstruction of a peasant's life in olden days, in the earliest part of the nineteenth century.

LESUEUR, DANIEL, pseudonym of MME JEANNE LAPAUZE (b. 1862). Prominent novelist and author of many volumes, including *l'Invincible charme*, *la Force du passé*, *Mortel secret*, and *Nietzschéenne*.

LICHTENBERGER, ANDRÉ (b. 1870). Novelist and sociologist, fond of historical stories reconstituting past ages: *la Mort de Corinthe*, *les Centaures*, *la Folle aventure*. Among his other works are *Mon petit Trott* and *la Petite sœur de Trott*.

LIÉGEARD, STÉPHEN (b. 1830). A poet still somewhat under the spell of Lamartine.

LOISY, ALFRED (b. 1857). For his position in the modernist movement cf. p. 835. He was a pupil of Mgr Duchesne, and, like Renan, grew at variance with the dogma of the church. But instead of leaving it he was excommunicated for his views. His chief works have been: *le Quatrième Evangile*, *les Evangiles synoptiques*, *l'Evangile et l'Eglise*, *Autour d'un petit livre*, *Simples réflexions sur le décret du Saint-Office et sur l'encyclique*. His religious attitude may be judged by the following extract from *l'Evangile et l'Eglise*:

"Les conceptions que l'Eglise présente comme des dogmes révélés ne sont pas des vérités tombées du ciel et gardées par la tradition religieuse dans la forme précise où elles ont paru d'abord. L'historien y voit l'interprétation de faits religieux, acquise par un laborieux effort de la pensée théologique. Que les dogmes soient divins par l'origine et la substance, ils sont

humains de structure et de composition. Il est inconcevable que leur avenir ne réponde pas à leur passé. La raison ne cesse pas de poser des questions à la foi, et les formules traditionnelles sont soumises à un travail perpetuel d'interprétation où la lettre qui tue est efficacement contrôlée par l'esprit qui vivifie."

LOTI, PIERRE, pseudonym of Julien Viaud (b. 1850). Member of the Academy. An officer in the French navy, who has travelled far and wide through the Orient and has described it in his numerous novels of exotic sensation. He is gifted with intense power of reproducing feelings and the effect of scenery: an absolute emotionalist, he belongs to the lineage of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre and of Chateaubriand. His word paintings of the ocean are striking. As a rule, his plots are insignificant and character analysis is almost wanting in him, his whole theory of life being voluptuous enjoyment disturbed only by the dread of old age, ugliness, and the dulling of the sensibilities. This is apt to cast a sensuous and melancholy dreaminess over his work. Morals and positive religion do not exist in his creed. The novels to which his reputation is due were chiefly those whose heroes love native women "somewhere east of Suez," in Japan, the South Seas, etc. Loti's women are all primitives. His most powerful novel is undoubtedly *Pêcheur d'Islande*, describing the existence of Breton fishermen who sail to the northern waters; but his pages picture Turkey, China, Japan, Palestine, the isles of the Pacific, India, Persia, the Senegal colony, the Basque country, Egypt: *le Mariage de Loti*, *le Roman d'un spahi*, *Mon frère Yves*, *Pêcheur d'Islande*, *Madame Chrysanthème*, *le Roman d'un enfant*, *Ramuntcho*, *la Troisième jeunesse de Madame Prune*, *les Désenchantées*, *la Mort de Philæ*.

LOUŸS, PIERRE (b. 1870). High-priest of nudity, and advocate of it for literature, art, and the stage; author of *Aphrodite*, *la Femme et le pantin*, *les Chansons de Bilitis* (pretended translations from the Greek), *les Aventures du roi Pausole*.

MAËL, PIERRE. A collective pseudonym for two authors, CHARLES CAUSSE (1862–1904) and CHARLES VINCENT (b. 1851),

who have been wholesale manufacturers of novels rather than novelists.

MAETERLINCK, MAURICE (b. 1862). A Belgian writer, hence accused by some French critics of having an exotic savor to his style. In youth he came into contact with *les jeunes* and the fantastic nature of Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, and was influenced by Poe and Ibsen. He expressed at first a vague symbolism, covering a mysticism not of ecstacy but of pessimism. He surrounded his plays with the paraphernalia of gloom dear to the old School of Terror, but not rationalised as in Mrs. Radcliffe; remaining, on the contrary, still more mysterious in their indefiniteness, over which hangs the fear of the hereafter. His plots unroll in gloomy castles amid melancholy cries and wailing prayers: it is like *The Fall of the House of Usher* mixed up with Grimm's fairy-tales grown nervous. Some of them were called "drames pour marionnettes." They lend themselves to ridicule and parody, but they have had great influence, and some of them have reached the consecration of the opera. Since the extinction of symbolism, Maeterlinck's plots have become, in a certain sense, more conventional though no less fanciful. His chief works are: *Serres chaudes* (poems), *la Princesse Maleine*, a Shaksperian imitation which, with the praise of Octave Mirbeau, originated his fame, *l'Intruse*, *les Aveugles*, *Pelléas et Mélisande*, *Alladine et Palomides*, *la Mort de Tintagiles*, *le Trésor des humbles* (essays), *Aglavaine et Sélysette*, *la Vie des abeilles*, *l'Intelligence des Fleurs*, *Ariane et Barbe bleue*, *Sœur Béatrice*, *Monna Vanna*, and *l'Oiseau bleu*.

MAGRE, MAURICE (b. 1877). Poet, originally a member of the so-called "group of Toulouse," author of plays, of poems of sympathy for the unfortunate (*la Chanson des hommes*), and of personal poems (*les Lèvres et le secret*) of unexpected frankness on the poet's part in revealing the secret side of one's nature.

MAINDRON, MAURICE (1857–1911). Historical novelist, fond of the sixteenth century. Among his works are: *le Tournoi de*

Vauplassans, Saint-Cendre, Blancador l'avantageux, Monsieur de Clérambon.

MARGUERITTE, PAUL (b. 1860) and VICTOR (b. 1866). Their most important works have been written in collaboration on the war of 1870, in which their father, General Margueritte, was killed: *le Désastre* (to be contrasted with Zola's *la Débâcle*), *les Tronçons du glaive, les Braves gens, la Commune.* These works have had success, but they are neither history nor novels. Their plays, such as *le Cœur et la loi, l'Autre, Prostituée,* contain a free treatment of social problems. They began by writing separately. Paul Margueritte wrote novels (*Pascal Géfosse*) and pantomimes, and Victor Margueritte, poems and light plays. Their collaboration began after 1889 but has again ceased for the present.

MARINETTI, F.-T. (b. 1878). Eccentric, anti-traditionalist Franco-Italian writer, born in Egypt; advocate of a literature of "futurism."

MARSOLLEAU, LOUIS (b. 1864). Poet (*les Baisers perdus*), journalist and vaudevillist, author of comedies in verse.

MASSON, FRÉDÉRIC (b. 1847). Member of the Academy. Historian of the life and times of Napoleon, fond of raking together every kind of material, no matter how insignificant, concerning his subject.

MAUCLAIR, CAMILLE (b. 1872). Poet, critic, novelist, lecturer, general æsthetician of great power of immediate reaction, but intensely modern in all his interests, an emotionalist.

MAURRAS, CHARLES (b. 1868). Journalist and critic, one of the founders with Jean Moréas of the *Ecole romane française*; now a critic, nationalist, and anti-republican writer, and a leader of the band which has fought Romanticism in the reaction towards a "Classical" or neo-Classical tradition. But M. Maurras's Classicism would under difficulty be recognised by a seventeenth-century writer, and consists largely in a reaction against Romanticism, and opposition to any literary, social, or political phase which seems un-French, because lacking in clearness,

precision and the perfection of completeness. "L'esprit classique ne cessa de répéter en grec, en latin, en français, en italien, en provençal, non seulement pour les peuples qui boivent à la coupe de notre mer, mais pour tout citoyen du monde, non seulement en art, mais dans les sciences et les industries, dans les arts de la politique et même de la vie, ce grand, cet uniforme et invariable conseil de *réaliser* avant toute chose, et pour cela de *définir*, de *préciser*, d' *organiser*."

MÉZIÈRES, ALFRED (b. 1826). Member of the Academy. Critic and politician, writer on Shakspere, Petrarch, Goethe, Mirabeau, etc.

MILLE, PIERRE (b. 1865). Semi-humorous journalist, critic, and story-teller.

MIRBEAU, OCTAVE (b. 1848). One of the most foul-minded writers that literature has produced; yet he deserves mention for the brilliant and vigorous play, *les Affaires sont les affaires*.

MONTÉGUT, MAURICE (b. 1855). Journalist, rhymer and voluminous author of novels and short stories.

MONTESQUIOU-FEZENSAC, COMTE ROBERT DE (b. 1855). A poet of Baudelairian preciosity and cultivator of paradox, the sort of person in whom one would seek the original of Huysmans's Des Esseintes or the peacock of Rostand's *Chantecler*. Author of *les Chauves-souris*, *la Clef des odeurs suaves*, *les Hortensias bleus*, *les Perles rouges*. (Cf. the title of Robert Hichens's *Green Carnation* and its skit of Oscar Wilde, the cultivator of similar paradoxes.)

MOREAU, EMILE (b. 1852). Dramatist, fond of historical plays, such as *le Procès de Jeanne d'Arc*.

MOSELLY, EMILE, pseudonym of EMILE CHÉNIN (b. 1870). Professor and man of letters; writer on Lorraine; made his reputation chiefly with *Jean des Brebis, ou le livre de la misère*.

MUN, COMTE ADRIEN-ALBERT DE (b. 1841). Member of the Academy. Writer on religion and politics, member of the Chamber of Deputies, champion of the Catholic cause.

NESMY, JEAN, pseudonym of HENRI SURCHAMP (b. 1876).

Poet and novelist, who writes chiefly about the country of Limousin.

NOAILLES, COMTESSE MATHIEU DE. Ultra-emotional poetess and novelist of Roumanian origin, rather derided by good critics ("une précieuse d'aujourd'hui"), but having many admirers. Her works include *le Cœur innombrable, l'Ombre des jours, les Eblouissements, la Nouvelle espérance, le Visage émerveillé, la Domination.*

NOLHAC, PIERRE DE (b. 1859). Curator of the museum at Versailles; poet, critic and humanist; writer on Petrarch, Erasmus, the Pléiade and the art and history of the times of Louis XV and Louis XVI.

NORMAND, JACQUES (b. 1848). Author of poems, novels, monologues and plays. His best known plays are *Musotte*, written with Guy de Maupassant, *Monsieur et madame Dugazon*, and *l'Amiral*, a pretty comedy dealing with the Dutch tulip craze.

OHNET, GEORGES (b. 1848). A much derided but highly successful novelist. The dramatisation of his novel *le Maître de forges* was one of the great successes of the last generation.

OLLIVIER, EMILE (b. 1825). Member of the Academy. At the downfall of the Empire, to which he had just rallied, Emile Ollivier withdrew from politics, and has devoted the last years of his life to the publication of an elaborate history of *l'Empire libéral.*

PÉLADAN, JOSÉPHIN (b. 1859). Eccentric writer who formerly dabbled in occultism and Rosicrucianism, calling himself the Sâr Mérodack. He still remains somewhat fantastic in style and critical attitude.

PELLISSIER, GEORGES (b. 1852). Critic and professor, has composed many works on literature, from a thesis on Du Bartas to a brief history of French literature, as well as studies of the literary currents in the nineteenth century, miscellaneous essays, etc.

PEYREBRUNE, GEORGES DE, pseudonym of MME EIMERY

(b. 1848). A novelist who has contributed many serials to the *Revue des Deux-Mondes* and the *Revue de Paris*. *Le Cas du Lieutenant Sigmarie* is one of her most successful works.

PHILIPPE, CHARLES-LOUIS (1876–1909). A writer whose reputation has been chiefly posthumous. The hardships of his life brought him into contact with many painful phases of existence. He belongs to the lineage of Rousseau and Tolstoy, and his stories border on confessions. His chief difficulty is the formulation of a plot sufficient to carry the narrative through. His chief works are: *la Mère et l'enfant*, *Bubu de Montparnasse* (a combination of intense Naturalism and of sentiment), *le Père Perdrix*, *Marie Donadieu*, *Croquignole*.

PLESSIS, FRÉDÉRIC (b. 1851). A professor and academic poet; author of *la Lampe d'argile*.

POINCARÉ, HENRI (b. 1854). Member of the Academy. Mathematician.

POINCARÉ, RAYMOND (b. 1860). Member of the Academy. Statesman and orator.

POMAIROLS, CHARLES DE (b. 1843). Poet and critic, admirer of Vigny, Lamartine and Sully Prudhomme.

PORTO-RICHE, GEORGES DE (b. 1849). A dramatist, mainly interested in love and its sufferings, whence his admirers are fond of comparing his treatment with that of Racine. He is, however, a Racine of the nerves. Author of *la Chance de Françoise*, *l'Infidèle*, *Amoureuse*, *le Passé*, *le Vieil homme*.

PRÉVOST, MARCEL (b. 1862). Member of the Academy. A novelist who has devoted himself almost entirely to analysis of the feelings of women; in that sense he is what the French term a "moralist." Some of his stories anticipate the present tendency of women writers themselves to disclose the secret feelings that rarely leave the heart. His notoriety was won by books like *Mademoiselle Jaufre*, *Lettres de femmes*, *les Demi-vierges* and *le Jardin secret*. Among his other works are *les Vierges fortes*, *Monsieur et madame Moloch*, *Lettres à Françoise*, *Lettres à Françoise mariée*.

d. 1912

QUILLARD, PIERRE (b. 1864). A poet, critic, and scholar, who belonged to the former group of Merrill, Mikhaël, Ghil, etc.

RAMEAU, JEAN (b. 1859), pseudonym of LAURENT LEBAÏGT, poet, novelist and fantastic rhymer.

REBOUX, PAUL (b. 1877). Author of exotic novels: *la Maison de danses* (Spanish), *la Petite Papacoda* (Italian).

RÉGNIER, HENRI DE (b. 1864). Member of the Academy. A poet, *conteur* and dramatic critic. One of the promoters of symbolism, a former follower of Mallarmé, a friend of Verlaine; he has now become much more conventional. He has written many novels and tales in the style of the libertine story-tellers of the eighteenth century, from Crébillon *fils* to Laclos, and volumes of poems, such as *Jeux rustiques et divins*, *les Médailles d'argile*, *la Cité des eaux*, *la Sandale ailée*, *le Miroir des heures*.

RENARD, JULES (1864–1910). A talented but bitter writer, known chiefly by *Poil de carotte*, the story of a little red-headed child, ill-treated and repressed, and *le Plaisir de rompre*, a one-act comedy, on the parting of a couple who have loved each other, a tabloid up-to-date *Bérénice*.

REVEL, JEAN, pseudonym of PAUL TOUTAIN (b. 1848). A Norman writer who has described his native province of the present and the past, in a somewhat elaborate and mannered language.

RIBOT, ALEXANDRE (b. 1842). Member of the Academy. Orator and statesman.

RICHEPIN, JEAN (b. 1849). Member of the Academy. A soldier during the Prussian war, then a rover, sailor, porter, and travelling actor, said to have Turanian blood. He began as a follower of Baudelaire, on the brutal side, by the sensational *Chansons des gueux*, for which he was imprisoned, and *les Blasphèmes*, but he has since then toned down. His novels began also by pictures of atrocities. His plays, such as *Nana-Sahib*, *Monsieur Scapin*, *le Filibustier*, *Par le glaive*, *Vers la joie*, *le Chemineau*, *les Truands*, etc., are of great richness of versification, and *le Chemineau* (portraying the vagabond) contains delicate poetry that one would never have expected after his

original hair-raising verse. Richepin is the bard of the vagabond and rover. His son, JACQUES RICHEPIN, is also a man of letters.

RIVOIRE, ANDRÉ (b. 1872). A poet and dramatist (*Il était une bergère, le Bon roi Dagobert*).

ROD, EDOUARD (b. 1857–1910). A Swiss, and for seven years professor at the university of Geneva, influenced by his compatriot, the philosopher Secrétan. He was at first a Naturalist, but overcame the tendency. He was fond of analysing the consciences of Protestants or of his fellow-Swiss, and was a psychological novelist. He cultivated Schopenhauer, Leopardi, Ibsen and Tolstoy, and was considered by some French critics a rather heavy pessimist. Author of *la Course à la mort, le Sens de la vie, les Trois cœurs, Stendhal, les Idées morales du temps présent, la Sacrifiée, la Vie privée de Michel Tessier, les Roches blanches, Là-haut, le Ménage du pasteur Naudié, l'Ombre s'étend sur la montagne, le Glaive et le bandeau.*

ROLLAND, ROMAIN (b. 1866). A lecturer at the Faculty of letters of Paris, a writer on music, author of a few historical plays, and especially of *Jean-Christophe*, a voluminous biographical romance describing the youth and adolescence of a musician and the development of his soul. Romain Rolland has been influenced by Ibsen and Tolstoy, and his desire is the creation of a "democratic" art.

ROSNY, J.-H., collective pseudonym of JUSTIN (b. 1856) and JOSEPH-HENRY (b. 1859) BOËX. They wrote so long together, forming one literary individuality, that people rarely differentiated between them. Their style grew labored and involved, abounding in neologisms and recondite terms drawn from the arts and sciences. Their subjects range from prehistoric days and the mammoth age, to present-day sociology and socialism, or to works of future scientific discovery. Among their best known writings are *Nell Horn* (Salvation Army), *le Bilatéral* (French socialism), *les Xipéhuz* (prehistoric), *le Termite, Daniel Valgraive, Vamireh* (prehistoric), *Sous le fardeau*. Of late they

have tended to part company as collaborators. The elder Rosny has also written some works under the pseudonym "Enacryos."

ROSTAND, EDMOND (b. 1868). Member of the Academy. The most talked of poet and dramatist of today. He won some reputation at an early age by a volume of poems, *les Musardises*; by the pretty comedy, *les Romanesques*, a medley of Musset and Shaksperian fantasy served up with the settings of Watteau; *la Princesse lointaine*, a dramatisation of the story of Geoffroy Rudel; *la Samaritaine*, a religious play on Jesus and the woman of Samaria. In December, 1897, when scarcely thirty years of age, he became famous all over the world by *Cyrano de Bergerac*, a "comédie héroïque," resuscitating the half-forgotten poet of the seventeenth century, and surrounding him with a halo of sentiment, idealism and romance. The play was hailed, in reaction against the naturalistic drama, as the beginning of a new epoch in literature, and the sanest critics, including Faguet, went delirious. It was soon pointed out by Lemaître that the merits of *Cyrano de Bergerac* were rather beauties revived than created, that the play was full of Hugo, Banville and Gautier's *Capitaine Fracasse*. The plot has its real foundation in an old vaudeville, played in 1836, called *Roquelaure, ou l'homme le plus laid de France*, by de Leuven, de Livry and Lhérie.

It is Romanticism brought up to date and touched with a little new symbolism in the character of Cyrano, the unappreciated lover, and in the heroism of his "panache." It purports to be a partial reconstitution of the spirit of the times portrayed, and is steeped in the preciosity of that period. In this style, M. Rostand, as an incomparable virtuoso of language and of rhyme, revels to the utmost. Hardly any one can read the play without being captivated by its magnificent swagger, by the animation of its scenes, by the poetry of its lines, by its sentiment, by the suffering love of Cyrano for Roxane, by the vigorous or graceful climaxes, by the wonderful, even though occasionally strained, wit with which it is sprinkled. At the same time *Cyrano*

is not a masterpiece of the first rank, but the best of the second order.

L'Aiglon, which followed *Cyrano* and which had as hero the son of Napoleon I ("L'Angleterre prit l'aigle et l'Autriche l'aiglon," to quote Hugo), was very far from reaching the merits of the previous play. The drama is long and rambling, and its alexandrines carry to excess the dislocation already visible in *Cyrano de Bergerac*. The much-advertised and long-postponed *Chantecler* again proved that M. Rostand had reached his highest level in *Cyrano*. It is full of Banvillesque tight-rope poetry, evanescent modern Parisian wit, often sinking to the commonest slang. It contains an occasional fine lyrical passage, such as the hymn to the sun, but it proved on performance to be extremely tedious, both because of the lagging plot and the disguise of the characters as birds and beasts, by which their movements were constrained and their voices made inaudible.

Edmond Rostand wishes to be thought the poet of bravery in quest of an unattainable ideal, and made more noble by its heroic paradox: "Frisez votre moustache, même si vous n'en avez pas," as he told the pupils of his old school, the Collège Stanislas. And in his inaugural speech at the Academy he defined as follows the term *panache*, the key word of *Cyrano*:

"Le panache, c'est l'esprit de la bravoure. Oui, c'est le courage dominant à ce point la situation qu'il en trouve le mot. Toutes les répliques du *Cid* ont du panache, beaucoup de traits du grand Corneille sont d'énormes mots d'esprit. Le vent d'Espagne nous apporta cette plume; mais elle a pris dans l'air de France une légèreté de meilleur goût. Plaisanter en face du danger, c'est la suprême politesse, un délicat refus de se prendre au tragique; le panache est alors la pudeur de l'héroïsme, comme un sourire par lequel on s'excuse d'être sublime."

Mme Rostand is the poetess Rosemonde Gérard.

Roujon, Henry (b. 1853). Member of the Academy. A journalist and art critic, author of essays and of *Miremonde*, a novel.

SÉGUR, MARQUIS PIERRE DE (b. 1853). Member of the Academy. Historical biographer of characters chiefly in the eighteenth century, such as Mme Geoffrin and Mlle de Lespinasse.

SOUZA, ROBERT DE (b. 1865). Symbolist poet and writer on the theory of the *vers libre*.

TAILHADE, LAURENT (b. 1857). Poet with some of the virtuosity of Banville combined with Gascon exuberance; author of "Aristophanic" poems. Clever but fantastic journalist and miscellaneous writer, dabbler in Plautus and more out-of-the-way writers and works, such as Petronius or the *Epistolæ obscurorum virorum*.

THUREAU-DANGIN, PAUL-MARIE-PIERRE (b. 1837). Member of the Academy. Historian of the Catholic school; has written on the monarchy of July and on the Catholic revival in England (Newman and the Oxford movement).

TINAYRE, MARCELLE. The leading woman writer of today. She has a rich and pictorial style and analyses love with a tone of sensuous moralising which may sometimes trouble Anglo-Saxon prudery, but which is reserve itself compared with the writings of many others. Her chief books are: *Avant l'amour*, *la Rançon*, *Hellé*, *l'Oiseau d'orage*, *la Maison du péché*, *la Vie amoureuse de François Barbazanges*, *la Rebelle*, *l'Amour qui pleure*, *l'Ombre de l'amour*, *la Douceur de vivre*.

TINSEAU, LÉON DE (b. 1844). Author of numerous novels and stories, lightly written with a touch of sentiment and romance.

VANDÉREM, FERNAND, pseudonym of FERNAND-HENRI VANDERHEYM (b. 1864). Chronicler of Parisian manners in novels and plays: *Charlie*, *la Patronne*, *la Cendre*, *les Deux rives*, *la Victime*, *le Calice*, *les Fresnay*, *Cher maître*.

VAUCAIRE, MAURICE (b. 1864). Poet, novelist and dramatist, who began with the Théâtre-Libre and the Théâtre-Antoine.

VEBER, PIERRE (b. 1869). Novelist, dramatist, and dramatic critic; smart and cynical.

VIOLLIS, JEAN, pseudonym of H. ARDENNE DE TIZAC (b. 1877). Poet and novelist of southern France.

VOGÜÉ, VICOMTE EUGÈNE MELCHIOR DE (b. 1848–1910). Member of the Academy. Diplomatist, novelist, critic, and writer on Russia.

VOGÜÉ, MARQUIS CHARLES-JEAN MELCHIOR DE (b. 1829). Member of the Academy. Archæologist and diplomatist.

WILLY, COLETTE. Writer and actress. Originally collaborated with her now divorced husband "Willy" (Henry Gauthier-Villars) in writing a series of popular but somewhat reprehensible stories, the adventures of Claudine. Her best work is *la Vagabonde*, the biography of a music-hall performer.

WOLFF, PIERRE (b. 1865). A dramatist who treats the Romantic topics of the rehabilitation of the courtesan or the hardships of the social laws in the style of a modern Realist, but with an element of strong *sensiblerie*. He will make you weep indifferently over illegitimate children, fast women, or girls who cannot get husbands. Author of *le Secret de Polichinelle*, *le Ruisseau*, *l'Age d'aimer*, *le Lys*, *les Marionnettes*.

YVER, COLETTE, pseudonym of MME ANTOINETTE HUZARD (b. 1874). Novelist, authoress of *Comment s'en vont les reines*, *Princesses de science*, *les Dames du Palais*.

ZAMACOÏS, MIGUEL (b. 1866). Originally an art student and merry jester at the *Chat noir*, now a journalist, and dramatist of the school of Rostand; author of sentimental and pretty, poetical plays such as *les Bouffons* and *la Fleur merveilleuse*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SECTION I

GENERAL INDICATIONS

I. HISTORY OF LITERATURE

A. — General Works

L. Petit de Julleville (Editor), *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française, des origines à 1900;* 8 vols., 1895–1899. Chapters of unequal merit by different authorities, but on the whole, of great value.

G. Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française*, 11th edition, 1909. The best one-volume manual.

F. Brunetière, *Manuel de l'histoire de la littérature française*, 2nd edition, 1899. Valuable, but difficult to use, because constructed in accordance with the author's theories of literary evolution.

Suchier und Birch-Hirschfeld, *Geschichte der französischen Literatur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart*, 1900. A valuable history, both scholarly and popular, in one large volume, containing a full treatment of the Middle Ages.

Nisard, *Histoire de la littérature française*, 4 vols., 1844–1861. Old-fashioned and antiquated, but valuable for understanding the formerly prevalent spirit of French literary criticism.

F. Godefroy, *Histoire de la littérature française depuis le XVIe siècle jusqu'à nos jours*, 9 vols., 1859–1881. Contains much information with extracts, but should be used with caution, and is not much referred to by historians.

The above-mentioned works are, perhaps, the most significant, but others will be found useful: E. Lintilhac, *Précis historique et critique de la littérature française*, 2 vols., with bibliographies, a "cram-book" for French students. — E. Faguet, *Histoire de la littérature française*, 2 vols., discursive but suggestive. — G. Pellissier, *Histoire de la littérature française*, 1 vol., clear and concise. — R. Doumic, *Histoire de la littérature française*, 1 vol., clear and concise. — C. Gidel, *Histoire de la littérature française*, 5 vols. — L. Claretie, *Histoire de la littérature française*, 4 vols., anecdotes and gossiping literature. — P. Albert, *Histoire de la littérature française*, 5 vols., disconnected chapters, but useful. — In English must be mentioned the somewhat old-fashioned history by H. Van Laun and the more recent works of G. Saints-

bury and E. Dowden. In German Heinrich Junker's *Grundriss der Geschichte der französischen Literatur* contains bibliographies useful to the student.

Great help in working up certain special authors and topics will be derived from F. Hémon, *Cours de littérature* in nine volumes, or thirty-one separate parts, a series of manuals for the use of French students preparing for examinations. No one investigating topics in modern literature should fail to consult the tables of contents of the numerous volumes of essays by such writers as Sainte-Beuve, Brunetière, Doumic, Faguet, Lemaître, etc. There are two volumes of indices to Sainte-Beuve: one comprising the *Causeries du lundi*, the *Portraits de femmes* and *Portraits littéraires*, by Pierrot; the other comprising the *Premiers lundis*, the *Nouveaux lundis*, and the *Portraits contemporains*, by Giraud. The essays of E. Scherer are suggestive; the psychological essays of P. Bourget are involved. For various studies on modern subjects, see V. Du Bled, *La société française du XVIe au XXe siècle*, 8 vols., since 1900.

A convenient one-volume manual of the French drama is Petit de Julleville, *le Théâtre en France*. A more ambitious but popular work is E. Lintilhac, *Histoire générale du théâtre en France*, in course of publication, to consist of about eight volumes. More scholarly is the *Geschichte des neueren Dramas* by W. Creizenach, dealing with the European drama in general, of which the first part of the fourth volume appeared in 1910. The English translation from the Danish of Mantzius's *History of Theatrical Art* is interesting for the study of the stage itself. The volume on Molière has also been translated into French. The Middle Ages in France are dealt with by Petit de Julleville, *les Mystères*, 2 vols., 1880; the same, *Répertoire du théâtre comique au moyen-âge*, 1885. An introductory manual is Mortensen, *le Théâtre français au moyen-âge*, French translation by Philipot, 1903.

The student should keep in mind the connection between history and literature by such a work as Cirot, Dufourcq, et Thiry, *Synchronismes de la littérature française*, in forty-four charts.

The student of the Middle Ages will use the essential Gröber's *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, 1902, which makes unnecessary the various other encyclopedias and methodologies of the Middle Ages of Körting or Neumann, etc.

The special student of periods later than the Middle Ages, particularly the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, will use:

La Croix du Maine et du Verdier, *Bibliothèques françaises*, edited by Rigoley de Juvigny, 6 vols., 1772–1773. Useful for the minor authors of the sixteenth century and their bibliographies.

Niceron, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres dans la république des lettres*, 43 vols., 1729–1745. Volumes X, XX, and XXX contain an index to the each ten volumes, and from Vol. XXXI on there is a general index in each volume to all the volumes published as the work progressed. Biographies and bibliographies.

Abbé Goujet, *Bibliothèque française, ou histoire de la littérature française*, 18 vols., 1740–1756. Vols. IX–XVIII deal with the poets. The odd-numbered volumes, beginning with Vol. I, contain, at the beginning, tables of authors' names for each series of two volumes; the even-numbered volumes contain, at the end, bibliographies for the corresponding volumes.

A. Baillet, *Jugements des Savants*, 8 vols., 1722–1730.

L. Moréri, *Grand dictionnaire historique*, 10 vols., 1759. Referred to for genealogical information.

P. Bayle, *Dictionnaire historique et critique*. The best edition is that of 1720 in four volumes. Bayle's dictionary was begun as a supplement to Moréri. It received supplements itself by Chaufepié, 4 vols., 1750–1756, and Prosper Marchand, 2 vols., 1758–1759. The most recent edition of Bayle, edited by Beuchot, 16 vols., 1820, incorporates some of the supplementary matter but omits other parts.

Frères Parfaict, *Histoire du théâtre français*, 15 vols., 1745–1749. Contains biographies, and summaries of plays in chronological order. Beginning with Vol. IV there are alphabetical lists of plays, authors, and actors mentioned in each volume. In Vol. IX there is a chronological list of plays down to 1665, which is continued in each volume thereafter. The modern drama begins in the second half of Vol. III (sixteenth century), after which the contents are: Vol. IV, 1601–1632; Vol. V, 1633–1638; Vol. VI, 1639–1645; Vol. VII, 1646–1653; Vol. VIII, 1654–1660; Vol. IX, 1661–1665; Vol. X, 1666–1669; Vol. XI, 1670–1676; Vol. XII, 1677–1685; Vol. XIII, 1686–1695; Vol. XIV, 1696–1708; Vol. XV, 1709–1721.

B. — The Middle Ages

Histoire littéraire de la France, par les religieux bénédictins de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur, continuée par des membres de l'Institut, 32 vols., 1733–1898, to be continued. Contains elaborate monographs on different authors, bringing French literature down to the fourteenth century. (*Table des quinze premiers volumes*, by Rivain, 1875.)

G. Gröber, *Französische Literatur* in his *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, Vol. II, Pt. i, 1902.

G. Paris, *la Littérature française au moyen-âge* (*XIe — XIVe siècle*), 4th edition, 1909. The most useful introductory manual in French.

G. Paris, *Esquisse historique de la littérature française au moyen-âge*, 1907. A different work from the previous one; a brief survey of the whole mediæval period.

C. Voretzsch, *Einführung in das Studium der altfranzösischen Literatur* (Sammlung kurzer Lehrbücher der romanischen Sprachen und Literaturen), 1905. A valuable introductory work with important bibliographies.

Ph. Aug. Becker, *Grundriss der altfranzösischen Literatur* (Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, edited by Meyer-Lübke), 1907. The first part has appeared, dealing with the beginnings and the heroic epic.

Interesting chapters on mediæval topics can be found in the volumes of miscellaneous essays by G. Paris: *la Poésie du moyen-âge*, 2 vols.; *Poèmes et légendes du moyen-âge; Légendes du moyen-âge*. A history of the somewhat unexplored literature of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries by F. Heuckenkamp is announced in the series containing Voretzsch's *Einführung*, and one on the fifteenth century by Fr. Ed. Schneegans in the same series as Becker's *Grundriss*.

C. — The Sixteenth Century

Darmsteter et Hatzfeld, *Le seizième siècle en France*, often reprinted. Contains literary history, biographies, grammatical survey, and extracts. Very useful, but needs to be brought up to date.

A. Birch-Hirschfeld, *Geschichte der französischen Literatur*, 1889. Only the first volume was published, dealing with the periods of Louis XII and Francis I.

H. Morf, *Geschichte der neueren französischen Literatur*, 1898. Only the first volume was published, dealing with the sixteenth century (bibliographies).

A. Tilley, *The Literature of the French Renaissance*, 2 vols., Cambridge, England, 1904. The most complete general survey of the period. The same author published in 1885 an introductory essay under the same title, dealing with the earliest period of the Renaissance.

F. Brunetière, *Histoire de la littérature française classique*, 1908. Only the first volume has appeared, dealing with the sixteenth century.

H. Guy, *Histoire de la poésie française au XVIe siècle*, Vol. I, 1910.

E. Faguet, *le Seizième siècle, études littéraires*, 1893.

The *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du Protestantisme français* is consulted chiefly for information concerning the sixteenth century, but is useful for other periods. The same is to be said of Haag, *la France protestante*. 1846–1858. A second edition, 1877–1888, did not progress beyond the letter G.

Valuable suggestions may still be obtained from Sainte-Beuve's *Tableau historique et critique de la poésie française et du théâtre français au XVIe siècle*, 1828; last edition, 1876. Among other older useful works, but to be used with much caution, are Philarète Chasles's *Etudes sur le seizième siècle en France*, Saint-Marc Girardin's *la Littérature française au XVIe siècle*, L. Feugère's *Caractères et Portraits littéraires du XVIe siècle*, and *les Femmes Poètes au XVIe siècle*.

D. — The Seventeenth Century

F. Lotheissen, *Geschichte der französischen Literatur im siebzehnten Jahrhundert*, 4 vols., 1878.

Père Longhaye, *Histoire de la littérature française au XVIIe siècle*, 4 vols., 1894–1896; clerical views.

J. Demogeot, *Tableau de la littérature française au XVIIe siècle, avant Corneille et Descartes*, 1859.

Robiou, *Essai sur l'histoire de la littérature et des mœurs pendant la première moitié du XVIIe siècle*, 1858.

A. Tilley, *From Montaigne to Molière, or the Preparation for the Classical Age of French Literature*, London, 1908.

E. Faguet, *le Dix-septième siècle, études littéraires*, 1885.

Valuable suggestions are to be found in the pages of Sainte-Beuve's *Port-Royal* and in Voltaire's *Siècle de Louis XIV*. See also the student's handbooks: Horion, *Explication du théâtre classique;* Vial et Denise, *Idées et Doctrines littéraires du XVIIe siècle;* and Hervier, *les Ecrivains français jugés par leurs contemporains.*

E. — The Eighteenth Century

H. Hettner, *Geschichte der französischen Literatur im achtzehnten Jahrhundert*, 5th edition revised by Morf, 1894.

Villemain, *Tableau de la littérature française au XVIIIe siècle*, 4 vols., 1828.

A. Vinet, *Histoire de la littérature française au XVIIIe siècle*, 2 vols., 1853.

E. Faguet, *le Dix-huitième siècle, études littéraires*, 1890.

Useful suggestions may be found in Edmond Scherer's *Etudes sur la littérature au XVIIIe siècle;* Prosper de Barante's *Tableau de la littérature française au XVIIIe siècle;* Ernest Bersot's *Etudes sur le XVIIIe siècle.* The *Lycée, ou Cours de littérature ancienne et moderne* of the eighteenth-century author La Harpe is useful as presenting the attitude of that age. See also the modern student's handbook of Vial et Denise, *Idées et doctrines littéraires du XVIIIe siècle.*

F. — The Nineteenth Century

G. Pellissier, *le Mouvement littéraire au XIXe siècle*, 1889.

J.-P. Charpentier, *la Littérature française au XIXe siècle*, 1875.

A. Michiels, *les Idées littéraires en France au XIXe siècle*, 2 vols., 1862.

G. Brandès, *Die Hauptströmungen der Literatur des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, 6 vols., 1872–1891. There is an English translation, and a French one of the volume on the Romantic school.

E. Faguet, *le Dix-neuvième siècle, études littéraires*, 1887.

E. Faguet, *Politiques et moralistes du XIXe siècle*, 3 vols., 1891–1899.

Brunetière, *Evolution de la poésie lyrique au XIXe siècle*, 1889.

C. Le Goffic, *la Littérature française au XIXe siècle*, 1910. Very concise, but mentions minor as well as major authors.

F. Strowski, *Histoire de la littérature française au XIXe siècle.* Announced for the end of 1911.

Les Célébrités d'aujourd'hui, a series of over forty brief biographies and critical studies, edited by E. Sansot-Orland, R. Le Brun, Ad. van Bever.

It may be useful to consult J. Lemaître, *les Contemporains*, 7 vols., 1885–1899.

G. — The Modern Drama

Dramatic criticism in the nineteenth century may, to a certain extent, be followed in the collected *feuilletons* and criticisms of Jules Janin, *Histoire de la littérature dramatique*, 6 vols., 1853–1858; Théophile Gautier, *Histoire de l'art dramatique en France depuis vingt-cinq ans*, 6 vols., 1858–1859; A. Vitu, *les Mille et une nuits du théâtre*, 9 vols., 1884–1893; J.-J. Weiss, *le Théâtre et les mœurs*, 1889, and *Trois années de théâtre* (1883–1885), 4 vols., 1892–1896; Francisque Sarcey, *Quarante ans de théâtre*, 8 vols., 1900–1902; Jules Lemaître, *Impressions de théâtre*, 10 vols., 1888–1898; Emile Faguet, *Notes sur le théâtre contemporain*, 7 vols., 1889–1895 and *Propos de théâtre*, 5 vols., 1903–1910; René Doumic, *De Scribe à Ibsen*, 1893, *Essais sur le théâtre contemporain*, 1896, and *le Théâtre nouveau*, 1908; A. Brisson, *le Théâtre*, frequent volumes since 1906. Yearly manuals of dramatic production are Stoullig, *Annales du théâtre et de la musique*, and Soubies's *Almanach des spectacles*. The doings of the Théâtre-Français are chronicled in annual volumes by Joannidès. The modern theatre is studied in the *Revue d'art dramatique;* the current drama may be followed pictorially in the monthly *le Théâtre* or journalistically in the daily *Comœdia*. The weekly paper *l'Illustration* publishes occasional supplements, *l'Illustration théâtrale*, containing the text of all the important new plays brought out in Paris.

The texts of the chief plays of the French drama down to the nineteenth century (including its first decades) can be found in several older collections or *répertoires* containing innumerable volumes. Among the chief ones are the *Répertoire général*, 1821–1825, in over two hundred volumes, partly edited by Lepeintre and published by Dabo; the *Répertoire général* of 1813, published by Lebel of Versailles; the *Répertoire général* of Nicolle, 1818; the *Répertoire* of Petitot, published by Foucault, 1817–1820; the *Répertoire* of Firmin Didot, 1821–1825.

The titles of other plays may be found in the *Catalogue de la bibliothèque du duc de la Vallière*, by Guillaume de Bure, 6 vols., 1788 (the books in this collection are chiefly at the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, in Paris); the *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de M. de Soleinne*, by le Bibliophile Jacob, 5 vols., 1843–1845. "Ce catalogue, extrêmement complet, dispenserait presque de toute autre investigation bibliographique, si l'ordre adopté n'y rendait les recherches fort difficiles, et si la confusion qui y règne, n'en diminuait le prix. La *Table des Auteurs* est fort rare, et la *Table des Pièces*, qui rendrait d'inappréciables services, n'a jamais été publiée. Pour les pièces jouées en province, ou non représentées, le *Catalogue Soleinne* fournit des références qu'on chercherait vainement ailleurs." (Gaiffe, *le Drame en France.*)

For titles of modern plays, see the *Catalogue général des œuvres dramatiques et lyriques* faisant partie du répertoire de la société des auteurs et compositeurs dramatiques. The third decennial catalogue covers the period Jan. 1, 1899 — Feb. 28, 1909.

The chief publishing-house of plays in the nineteenth century, until rivals

have sprung up, has been the firm bearing the successive names of J.-N. Barba (1780–1839), Christophe Tresse (1839–1845), Nicolas Tresse (1845–1871), veuve Tresse (1871–1885), Tresse et Stock (1885–1896), P.-V. Stock. In 1816 the firm incorporated the rival house of Dabo (see above, *Répertoire* of Dabo).

II BIBLIOGRAPHIES AND JOURNALS

A. — General Works[1]

E. G. W. Braunholtz, *Books of Reference for Students and Teachers of French. A Critical Survey*, London, 1901. A brief pamphlet, but a useful introductory work for the beginner.

A. Schulze, *Ueber einige Hilfsmittel französischer Bibliographie*, in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, Vol. XCIX. An article laying some stress on German works.

J.-Ch. Brunet, *Manuel du libraire*, 5th edition, 6 vols., 1860–1865. The most important French bibliography, containing mention of peculiar, rare, curious, and general books. The sixth volume contains a systematic index.

G. Brunet et P. Deschamps, *Supplément au Manuel du libraire*, 2 vols., 1878–1880.

Graesse, *le Trésor des livres rares et précieux*, 7 vols., 1859–1869.

G. Lanson, *Manuel bibliographique de la littérature française moderne (1500–1900)*. The most convenient student's manual, appearing since 1909. Three volumes (sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries) have been issued.

The student of special authors will find it convenient to consult the catalogues of the Bibliothèque nationale and of the British Museum, which should be found in good libraries. Of the former forty-one volumes had appeared in 1910, only down to the letter D. The latter consists of a *Catalogue*, 1881–1900, and of a *Supplement*, 1882–1899.

See also the *Catalogue des livres composant la bibliothèque poétique de M. Viollet le Duc*, 1843.

B. — Anonymous Books and Pseudonyms

Quérard, *Supercheries littéraires dévoilées*, 2nd edition, 3 vols., 1879.

Barbier, *Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes*, 3d edition, 4 vols., 1872–1879.

G. Brunet, *Supplément* to the two previous works, 1889.

Weller, *Die falschen und fingierten Druckorte*, 1864 (French part: *Dictionnaire des ouvrages français portant de fausses indications des lieux d'impression et des imprimeurs*).

Weller, *Lexicon pseudonymorum*, 1886.

G. d'Heilly, *Dictionnaire des pseudonymes*, 1887.

[1] Among bibliographies of bibliographies, the older ones of Petzholdt, 1866, and of Vallée, 1884–1887, have been mainly superseded by Stein, *Manuel de bibliographie générale*, 1897.

F. Drujon, *les Livres à clef*, 1888.

See also, for the Middle Ages: A. Franklin, *Dictionnaire des noms, surnoms et pseudonymes latins de l'histoire littéraire du moyen-âge, 1100 à 1530*, 1875.

C. — Biographical Dictionaries and Encyclopedias

In addition to works already mentioned, such as Moréri and Bayle, there are two old-fashioned but sometimes useful dictionaries: the *Biographie universelle* of Michaud, 45 vols., 1843–1865, and the *Nouvelle biographie générale* of Hœfer, 46 vols., 1852–1866 (on these two works cf. R. C. Christie, *Biographical Dictionaries* in *Selected Essays*).

More recent are: Larousse, *Grand dictionnaire universel*, 17 vols. — *La Grande Encyclopédie*, 31 vols., 1886–1902. — *Nouveau Larousse illustré*, 8 vols., not identical with the Larousse mentioned above. — Current events and new books are recorded in the *Larousse mensuel illustré*. — Jal, *Dictionnaire critique de biographie et d'histoire*, Errata et supplément pour tous les dictionnaires historiques, 1872. — Vapereau's *Dictionnaire des littératures* and *Dictionnaire des contemporains* need revision, but are useful.

D. — Early Printed and Rare Books

The student of French literature rarely has occasion to consult the repertories of incunabula and early printed books recorded in the various works, "annals," "repertories," and their supplements, of Maittaire, Panzer, Hain, Copinger, Reichling, and K. Burger. Nor is the more specifically French, *la France littéraire au XVe siècle* of G. Brunet, 1865, of very great service to him. His interest begins with the important *Histoire de l'imprimerie* of A. Claudin, 3 vols., 1900–1904, significant for the study of Humanism. He will find similar information for the study of the scholar-printers of the sixteenth century in the studies and bibliographies of A.-A. Renouard and Ph. Renouard. Further technical repertories are Delalain, *Essai de Bibliographie de l'histoire de l'imprimerie typographique*, 1903; G. Lepreux, *Gallia typographica*, 1909, "répertoire biographique et chronologique de tous les imprimeurs de France depuis les origines de l'imprimerie jusqu'à la Révolution."

Other useful bibliographies are:

Beaulieux, *Catalogue de la Réserve XVIe siècle de la bibliothèque de l' Université de Paris*, 1910.

F. Lachèvre, *Bibliographie des Recueils collectifs de poésie publiés de 1577 à 1700*, 4 vols., 1901–1906.

J. Le Petit, *Bibliographie des principales éditions originales d'écrivains du XVe au XVIIIe siècle*, 1888.

E. Picot, *Catalogue des livres composant la bibliothèque de feu M. le baron James de Rothschild*, 4 vols., 1884–1897.

The amateur bibliophile will find a first aid to book-collecting in Rahir, *la Bibliothèque de l'amateur*, 1907. The monthly catalogues of the Librairie Morgand have considerable bibliographical value.

E. — The Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries

Quérard, *la France littéraire*, 10 vols., 1827–1829, with a Supplement, 2 vols.

Quérard, Maury, Louandre, et Bourquelot, *la Littérature française contemporaine*, 6 vols., 1842–1857.

Laporte, *Histoire littéraire du XIXe siècle*, 7 vols., 1884–1890, "supplément de Brunet, Quérard, Barbier, etc."

G. Vicaire, *Manuel de l'amateur des livres au XIXe siècle*, 7 vols., in course of publication since 1894.

H. P. Thieme, *Guide bibliographique de la littérature française de 1800 à 1906*, 1907. A convenient volume containing many references to periodical literature.

L.-P. Betz, *la Littérature comparée*, 2d edition, 1904.

R. Federn, *Répertoire bibliographique de la littérature française des origines à 1911*. Issue of parts begun at Leipzig in 1911.

For publications since 1840 the most important bibliography is Lorenz, *Catalogue général de la librairie française*, continued by Jordell, 22 vols. The *Lorenz* is divided into two series of volumes: one series contains the catalogue of authors, the other indices. In the first series the titles of books are classed alphabetically by authors' names, and these names are usually accompanied, as in the *France littéraire* of Quérard, by brief biographical notices containing dates, pseudonyms, etc. Mention of works indicates size, number of volumes, editions, dates, publishers, publication price. Anonymous books and collections are entered alphabetically, omitting the article. The volumes of tables include a slightly briefer alphabetical list by contents. The *distribution* of the volumes is as follows: — *Auteurs:* 1840–1875, Vols. I–VI; 1876–1885, Vols. IX, X; 1886–1890, Vol. XII; 1891–1899, Vols. XIV, XV; 1900–1905, Vols. XVIII, XIX; 1906–1909, Vols. XXI, XXII. *Matières:* 1840–1875, Vols. VII, VIII; 1876–1885, Vol. XI; 1886–1890, Vol. XIII; 1891–1899, Vols. XVI, XVII; 1900–1905, Vol. XX.

Le Soudier's *Bibliographie française*, 10 vols., 1900, is a collection of publishers' lists, accompanied by an index of authors' names and a systematic index. It is continued at intervals of five years by a second series, consisting of index of authors, index of titles, index of topics: *tome* I, 1900–1904; *tome* II, 1905–1909, in two volumes.

For the newest works and for announcements there are several publications more or less complete, among which it suffices to mention: *la Bibliographie de la France* (journal général de l'imprimerie et de la librairie), containing information supplied by the government copyright department, published since 1811, weekly, has an annual supplement of school books in September; *le Mémorial de la librairie* of Le Soudier, smaller and cheaper, continuing the *Bibliographie française*, sufficient for the ordinary student, weekly, or in the still more abridged form of a monthly *Bulletin;* the *Bulletin mensuel des récentes publications françaises*, new additions to the Bibliothèque nationale;

Jordell, *Catalogue mensuel de la librairie française*, monthly subject-list with annual index; *la Bibliographie mensuelle* (monthly, with the exception of August and September); *Polybiblion*, a monthly bibliographical journal of orthodox religious tendencies, contains reviews of books, bibliographies of important French and foreign books, and summaries of periodicals.

N.B. — The ordinary student can, in a general way, keep up with the progress of scholarship by following the bibliographies of current publications in such periodicals as the *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, the *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*, the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* (annual but several years in arrears). The *Revue d'histoire littéraire* publishes a selected bibliography of literary articles in the daily and weekly press. The *Annales des lettres françaises* is a handy annual volume consisting of a literary and dramatic calendar.

For French periodicals in general consult Le Soudier, *Annuaire des journaux, revues et publications périodiques parus à Paris*, or the *Annuaire de la presse française et étrangère*.

University theses are recorded in:

Mourier et Deltour, *Catalogue et analyse des thèses latines et françaises*, etc., annual, but no longer issued.

Catalogue des thèses et écrits académiques, published annually under the auspices of the Ministry of Public Instruction.

A. Maire, *Répertoire alphabétique des thèses de doctorat-ès-lettres* (1810–1900), 1903.

As German dissertations often deal with French subjects, the following may be mentioned, even though not always confined to literature:

H. Varnhagen, *Systematisches Verzeichnis der Programmabhandlungen, Dissertationen und Habilitationsschriften*, 2d edition, revised by Joh. Martin, 1893.

R. Klussmann, *Systematisches Verzeichnis der Abhandlungen, welche in den Schulschriften sämtlicher am Programmaustausch teilnehmenden Lehranstalten erschienen sind*, 4 vols., 1889–1903.

Jahres-Verzeichnis der an den deutschen Universitäten erschienenen Schriften, since Aug., 1885.

Bibliographischer Monatsbericht über neu erschienene Schul- und Universitätsschriften, since 1889–1890.

See also: *Catalogue des dissertations et écrits académiques provenant des échanges avec les universités étrangères et reçues à la Bibliothèque nationale*, annual.

F. — Reviews and Journals

The periodical reviews are far too numerous to mention in full, and the best ones are generally useful both as critical journals and as bibliographical surveys of contemporary articles. Among the important ones are:

a. — FRENCH

i. — *Technical*

Journal des Savants, general erudition. Index (1859–1908) by J. Tissier.

Romania, the leading organ for the study of Romance Philology. Index to the first thirty volumes by A. Bos, 1906.

Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des chartes.

Revue des langues romanes, gives much attention to Provençal.

Annales du midi.

Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, deals with literature since the beginning of the Renaissance. Its current bibliographies include mention of articles in the best weeklies and even dailies. Index to first four volumes (1894–1898) by Maurice Tourneux, 1900. A new index is in preparation.

Revue des études Rabelaisiennes, now deals not only with Rabelais, but with general questions concerning the first half of the sixteenth century and the early Renaissance.

Revue critique d'histoire et de littérature, devoted entirely to critical reviews of new works of erudition. Index (from 1866 to 1890), 1895.

Revue universitaire, besides general articles and reviews often contains useful bibliographies of stated authors studied in connection with French official examinations, such as the *licence* and the *agrégation.*

Revue des cours et conférences, summaries of important lectures delivered by professors at the Sorbonne, the Collège de France, etc.

Bulletin du bibliophile et du bibliothécaire, for the collecting of valuable books. Index (from 1834 to 1906), 1907.

L'Intermédiaire des chercheurs, a French *Notes and Queries*. Index of the years 1864–1896.

Revue critique des livres nouveaux, somewhat less technical than the *Revue critique.*

Bulletin italien, relations between French and Italian literatures.

Revue hispanique, relations between French and Spanish literatures.

N.B. As a guide to the contents of the above-mentioned periodicals, see Maire, *Catalogue de toutes les tables générales de matières des Revues et Sociétés savantes*, announced in 1911.

ii. — *General*

Revue des Deux-Mondes, the heavy-weight of French literary reviews.

Revue de Paris.

Le Correspondant, conservative.

La Nouvelle Revue.

La Revue, the French *Review of Reviews.*

Revue bleue, revue politique et littéraire.

Revue hebdomadaire, light and easy articles.

Mercure de France, organ of the unacademic and unconventional sets.

Chronique des lettres françaises, not a very significant periodical, but useful because of the attention it devotes to minor authors and poets.

The most serious dailies are the *Temps* and the *Journal des Débats*, both of which contain useful literary and dramatic articles. There is a weekly edition of the *Journal des Débats* called the *Hebdo-Débats*.

b. — AMERICAN AND ENGLISH

Publications of the Modern Language Association of America.
Modern Language Notes, brief investigations.
Romanic Review, down to the end of the sixteenth century.
Modern Philology.
Modern Language Review, English.

c. — GERMAN

Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen, modern literature in general, still often called after its founder Herrig's *Archiv*, though edited by A. Brandl and H. Morf. German, French, and English topics.

Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, contains important annual bibliographies.

Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, modern French, original articles, reviews, bibliographies.

III. HISTORY

A. — GENERAL WORKS

The most interesting history of France on a large scale remains that of Michelet; Henri Martin's work is long-winded. The *Histoire générale* of Lavisse and Rambaud is a general survey of European history somewhat akin to Petit de Julleville's history of literature. The *Cambridge Modern History* (bibliographies) begins with the Renaissance. The standard history is now the co-operative *Histoire de France, depuis les origines jusqu'à la Révolution*, edited by Lavisse, in eighteen volumes (9 *tomes*). Interesting to the general reader is *l'Histoire de France racontée à tous*, in course of publication in six volumes, edited by Fr. Funck-Brentano, and written by MM. Funck-Brentano, Batiffol, J. Boulenger, Stryienski, and Madelin. Duruy's school *Histoire de France*, in two volumes, though written long ago, is an interesting introduction. The new *Histoire Larousse*, in two volumes, is popular and pictorial. G. W. Kitchin's *History of France* (3 vols.) is in English. The short *Histoire de la civilisation française* and *Histoire de la civilisation contemporaine en France* of Rambaud take up another side of history but are no longer quite new.

B. — Bibliographies

G. Monod, *Bibliographie de l'histoire de France*, 1888.

C.-V. Langlois, *Manuel de bibliographie historique*, 1901–1904.

U. Chevalier, *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen-âge.* "Bio-bibliography," second edition, 1905–1907 and "Topo-bibliography," 1894 and foll.

A. Potthast, *Bibliotheca historica medii aevi*, Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke des europäischen Mittelalters, 2d edition, 2 vols., 1896.

H. Bresslau, *Quellen und Hilfsmittel zur Geschichte der romanischen Völker im Mittelalter*, in Gröber's *Grundriss*, III, iii.

Les Sources de l'histoire de France, Part I, from the beginning to 1494, A. Molinier, 6 vols., 1901–1906 (Index, the sixth volume, by L. Polain). This work connects closely literature and history. Part II, the Sixteenth Century (1494–1610) by H. Hauser, in course of publication. Later periods are in preparation.

The relation of history and literature in new publications can be followed in such periodicals as the *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, the *Revue historique*, the *Revue des questions historiques*, the *Revue de synthèse historique*, the *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*. See Brière et Caron, *Répertoire méthodique de l'histoire moderne et contemporaine*, 1899 and foll.

IV. PHILOSOPHY

The important philosophical works are mentioned in the bibliography of the chapters. But see the important bibliographies in Ueberweg-Heinze, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, 9th edition, 1902–1903, 10th edition (Modern Philosophy), 1906–1907.

The relations of literature and philosophy in current literature may be followed by means of such periodicals as the *Revue philosophique* and the *Année philosophique.*

V. HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE

A. — Grammar and Syntax

Consult *supra*, under History of Literature and Bibliography. Also, for the Romance languages in general:

Diez, *Romanische Grammatik*, somewhat old-fashioned, French translation by G. Paris and Morel-Fatio.

Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke, *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*, 3 vols., 1894–1899, French translation by Rabiet and Doutrepont.

For French in particular:

Nyrop, *Grammaire historique de la langue française*, 1899–1908, 2nd edition of Vol. I, 1904.

F. Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900*, in course of publication since 1905.

Darmsteter, *Cours de grammaire historique*, edited by Muret and Sudre, a readable study.

For Old French:

Schwan-Behrens, *Grammatik des Altfranzösischen*, 8th edition, 1909.

For the sixteenth century:

Darmsteter et Hatzfeld, *le Seizième siècle*, the most convenient student's manual (cf. *supra* p. 886).

Benoist, *la Syntaxe française entre Palsgrave et Vaugelas*, 1877.

Livet, *la Grammaire et les Grammairiens au XVIe siècle*, 1859.

Thurot, *la Prononciation française depuis le commencement du XVIe siècle*, 2 vols., 1881–1884.

The last three works are not for beginners.

For the seventeenth century:

Haase, *Französische Syntax*, etc., particularly the French translation by Obert, *la Syntaxe française au XVIIe siècle*, 1898, important.

For the eighteenth century:

Gohin, *les Transformations de la langue française de 1740 à 1789*, 1903.

A. François, *la Grammaire du purisme et l'Académie française*, 1905.

For the nineteenth century:

Horluc et Marinet, *Bibliographie de la syntaxe du Français (1840–1905)*, 1908.

An interesting and useful elementary study of style in modern French is Lanson, *l'Art de la Prose*, 1909.

B. — Dictionaries

Etymological dictionaries of the Romance languages:

Fr. Diez, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der romanischen Sprachen*, 5th edition, 1887.

G. Körting, *Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch*, 3d edition, 1907.

Old French:

F. Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*, 10 vols., 1881–1902 (abridgment by Bonnard et Salmon, 1 vol., 1901).

Sixteenth century:

R. Cotgrave, *French and English Dictionary*, 1611.

Nicot, *Trésor de la langue française*, Paris, 1606; Rouen, 1618.

Seventeenth and eighteenth centuries:

Richelet, *Dictionnaire de la langue française ancienne et moderne*, 3 vols., 1728.

Dictionnaire de Trévoux, 8 vols., 1771.

E. Huguet, *Petit Glossaire des classiques française du XVIIe siècle*, 1907.

Consult also the glossaries and *lexiques* of the series of the *Grands Ecrivains de la France*.

Modern French:

E. Littré, *Dictionnaire de la langue française*, 1863 ff., 4 vols. and supplement, remains, on the whole, the standard dictionary. There is an abridged edition by Littré and Beaujean.

Hatzfeld, Darmsteter et Thomas, *Dictionnaire général de la langue française du commencement du XVIIe siècle à nos jours*, 2 vols., no date, smaller than Littré, but tends to displace it in many respects, especially for etymologies.

Dictionnaire de l'Académie française, 8th edition, 2 vols., 1878, standard for orthography, etc., but not very generally used.

The various Larousse dictionary-encyclopedias (cf. *supra*) are useful but less authoritative. Lesaint, *Traité de la prononciation française*, 3d edition, 1890, though issued in Germany, is useful for the confusing pronunciation of French nouns, especially proper names.

For slang and unconventional French, the latest works of value are: Delesalle, *Dictionnaire argot-français et français-argot*, 1896; H. France, *Dictionnaire de la langue verte*, 1907; A. Bruant, *Dictionnaire français-argot*, 1905; A. Barrère, *Argot and Slang*, a French-English Dictionary, London, 1889. Cf. L. Sainéan, *l'Argot ancien* (1455–1850), 1907.

VI. PROSODY

Convenient elementary handbooks are:

Le Goffic et Thieulin, *Traité de versification française.*

Quicherat, *Petit traité de versification française.*

L. E. Kastner, *History of French Versification*, Oxford, 1903.

The more advanced student will proceed to:

A. Tobler, *Vom französischen Versbau alter und neuer Zeit*, 5th edition, 1910; French translation by Breul and Sudre, 1885.

Becq de Fouquières, *Traité général de versification française*, 1879.

Clair Tisseur, *Modestes observations sur l'art de versifier*, Lyons, 1893 (rare).

M. Souriau, *Evolution du vers français au XVIIe siècle*, 1893.

SECTION II

SYSTEMATIC BIBLIOGRAPHY

Preliminary Note

The following bibliography is not exhaustive but selective. It is intended to designate, for the benefit of foreign students working at long range, the most useful critical and biographical studies concerning the authors and topics mentioned in the text. For the sake of conciseness these indications are limited to the author's name, the title (sometimes abridged), and the date of publication. Place of publication and number of volumes are usually omitted: the vast majority of works were issued in Paris. This bibliography does not do away with the necessity, for advanced investigation, of consulting such works as Lanson's *Manuel de bibliographie*, though it often specifies books not there recorded. It should also be considered, along with the titles specified in the preceding general bibliography, as including the chief authorities used in the preparation of this history.

PART I

CHAPTER I

See the various philological and historical works recorded in the General Bibliography, especially: Brunot, *Hist. de la langue fr.;* E. Lavisse, *Hist. de France.* — G. Renard, *la Méthode scientifique de l' histoire littéraire*, 1900. — H. Taine, on the "esprit gaulois" *passim*, e.g. in *La Fontaine et ses fables*, 1853. — E. Renan, *Essai sur la poésie des races celtiques*, in *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, 1854. — G. Michaut, *le Génie latin*, 1899. — A. Fouillée, *Psychologie du peuple français*, 1898. — E. Freymond, *Jongleurs und Menestrels*, Halle, 1883. — E. Faral, *les Jongleurs en France au moyen-âge*, 1910. — E. K. Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage*, Oxford, 1903. — A. Ebert, *Histoire générale de la littérature du moyen-âge en Occident* (French translation), 1883–1889. — L. Maître, *les Ecoles épiscopales et monastiques de l'occident depuis Charlemagne jusqu'à Philippe-Auguste*, 1866. — Mullinger, *The Schools of Charles the Great*, London, 1877. — L. Havet, *Que doivent à Charlemagne les classiques latins?* in *Revue bleue*, 1906. — A. F. West, *Alcuin*, New York, 1892.

CHAPTER II

L. Gautier, *l'Epopée nationale*, in Petit de Julleville's *Histoire de la litt. française*, Vol I, (1896). — L. Gautier, *les Epopées françaises*, 2nd ed., 4 vols., 1888–94, and *Bibliographie des chansons de geste*, up to 1890, 1 vol., 1897. — E. Langlois, *Tableau des noms propres de toute nature compris dans les chansons de gestes imprimées*, 1904. — G. Paris, *Histoire poétique de Charle-*

magne, 2nd ed., 1905. — P. Rajna, *le Origini dell' epopea francese*, Florence, 1884 (cf. G. Paris in *Romania*, Vol. XIII). — C. Nyrop, *Storia dell' epopea francese*, etc., translated from the Danish by E. Gorra, Turin, 1888. — G. Kurth, *Histoire poëtique des Mérovingiens*, 1893. — P. Paris, *les Chansons de geste*, in *Hist. litt. de la France*, Vol. XXII. — J. Bédier, *les Légendes épiques*, 1908 ff. — J. Bauquier, *Bibliographie de la Chanson de Roland*, 1877. — E. Seelmann, *Bibliographie des altfranz. Rolandsliedes*, 1888. — F. Lot, *l'Elément historique de Garin le Loherain*, in *Etudes d' histoire du moyen-âge, dédiées à G. Monod*, 1896. — L. Jordan, *Die Sage von den vier Haimonskindern*, 1905. — A. Jeanroy, *Etudes sur le cycle de Guillaume*, in *Romania*, Vols. XXV and XXVI. — R. Weeks, *Etudes sur Aliscans*, in *Romania*, Vol. XXX. — H. Suchier, *Recherches sur les chansons de Guillaume d'Orange*, in *Romania*, Vol. XXXII. — On *Huon de Bordeaux:* G. Paris, *Poèmes et légendes du moyen-âge*, 1900, and *Romania*, Vol. XXIX. — A. Longnon, *l'Elément historique de Huon de Bordeaux*, in *Romania*, Vol. VIII. — Counson, *la Légende d'Obéron*, in *Revue générale*, Brussels, 1903. — H. Pigeonneau, *le Cycle de la croisade et de la famille de Bouillon*, 1877. — O. Rohnström, *Etude sur Jehan Bodel*, Upsala, 1900. — E. Langlade, *Jehan Bodel*, 1909.

Editions: *Gormond et Isembard* (*le Roi Louis*), ed. R. Heiligbrodt, *Romanische Studien*. — *Karls Reise* (*Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*), ed. Koschwitz, 1904. — *La Chançun de Guillelme*, ed. Suchier, 1911. — *Chanson des Saisnes*, ed. Menzel und Stengel, 1906. — *Chanson d'Aspremont*, ed. Guessard et Gautier, 1855. — *Raoul de Cambrai*, ed. P. Meyer et A. Longnon, 1882. — *Garin le Loherain*, ed. P. Paris, 1833–36. — *Hervis de Mes*, ed. Stengel, 1903. — *Renaus de Montauban*, ed. Michelant, 1862. — *Doon de Mayence*, ed. A. Pey, 1859. — *Aimeri de Narbonne*, ed. Demaison, 1888. — *Girart de Viane*, ed. P. Tarbé, 1850. — *Chanson d'Antioche*, ed. P. Paris, 1848. — *La Conquête de Jérusalem*, ed. Hippeau, 1868. — *La Chanson du Chevalier au cygne et de Godefroi de Bouillon*, ed. Hippeau, 1874–77. — Editions of the *Chanson de Roland:* Th. Müller, *la Ch. de Roland*, 1878; E. Stengel, *Das altfranz. Rolandslied*, 1900. — English translations, by J. O'Hagan (verse) London, 1880; by Isabel Butler (prose), Boston, 1904. — *Aliscans*, ed. Guessard et Montaiglon, 1870 (*Anciens poètes de la France*). — *Huon de Bordeaux*, ed. F. Guessard et C. Grandmaison, 1860 (*Anciens poètes de la France*). The general reader may consult Lord Berners' English translation, published e.g. in the *Tudor Translations*, or Gaston Paris's French edition.

CHAPTER III

G. Paris, *les Romans de la Table-Ronde*, in *Hist. litt. de la France*, Vol. XXX (1888). — W. Foerster, Introd. to his ed. of Chrétien de Troyes's *Lancelot*, 1899. — G. Paris, *Tristan et Yseult*, in *Revue de Paris*, 1894. — A. Bossert, *la Légende chevaleresque de Tristan et Iseult*, 1902. — J. Bédier, *les Lais de Marie de France*, in *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, 1891. — Wilmotte, *l'Evolution*

du roman français aux environs de 1150, (Proceedings of the Académie royale de Belgique, 1903). — Borodine, *la Femme et l'amour au XIIe siècle d'après les poèmes de Chrétien de Troyes*, 1909. — H. Emecke, *Crestien von Troyes als Persönlichkeit und als Dichter*, 1892. — O. Schulz, *Die Darstellung psycholog. Vorgänge i.d. Romanen des Kristian von Tr.*, 1903. — E. Martin, *Zur Gralsage*, 1880. — A. Nutt, *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail*, London, 1888. — E. Wechssler, *Die Sage vom heiligen Gral*, 1898. — W. W. Newell, *The Legend of the Holy Grail and the 'Perceval' of Chrétien de Troyes*, Cambridge, Mass., 1902. — On André le Chapelain, see G. Paris, *Romania*, XII. p. 524 ff; G. Paris, *Journal des Savants*, 1888, pp. 664 ff, 727 ff. — A. Graf, *Roma nel medio evo e nelle immaginazioni del medio evo*, Turin, 1882. — Comparetti, *Virgilio nel medio evo*, 2nd ed., 1896. (There is an English translation of the first edition.) — J. Tunison, *Master Virgil*, Cincinnati, 1888. — L. Sudre, *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon libros quomodo nostrates medii ævi poetæ imitati interpretatique sint*, 1893. — N. E. Griffin, *Dares and Dictys*, Johns Hopkins Univ. diss., 1909. — C.-V. Langlois, *la Société française au XIIIe siècle d'après dix romans d'aventure*, 1904. — Joly, *Benoît de Sainte-More et le Roman de Troie*, 1870-71, Introd. and text. — P. Meyer, *Alexandre le Grand dans la littérature française du moyen-âge*, 1886, studies and text. — On *Floire et Blanchefleur*, G. Huet, *Sur l'origine de Floire et Blanchefleur*, in *Romania*, 1899; cf. *Romania*, 1906, p. 95; *Journal des Savants* 1901, p. 707; *Revue de philologie française*, Vol. XIX. — For the general reader: P. Paris, *les Romans de la Table-Ronde*, 5 vols., 1868–77; J. Bédier, *le Roman de Tristan*, 1900. The general reader may also turn to the versions and adaptations of Miss Jessie Weston; also William Morris's *Old French Romances*. See W. MacCallum, *Tennyson's Idylls and Arthurian Story*, Edinburgh, 1894; H. Maynadier, *The Arthur of the English Poets*, Boston, 1907.

Editions: Thomas, *Roman de Tristan*, ed. Bédier, 1902. — Béroul, *Roman de Tristan*, ed. E. Muret, 1903. — *La Folie Tristan*, ed. Bédier, 1907. — Marie de France, *Lais*, ed. K. Warnke, 1900. — Chrétien de Troyes, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. W. Foerster, 1884–99 (*Cligès*, *Yvain*, *Erec*, *Lancelot*). Also text editions of *Cligès*, *Yvain*, *Erec*. — *Perceval le Gallois*, ed. Potvin, 6 vols., 1866. — Robert de Boron, *le Roman du Saint Graal*, ed. F. Michel, 1841. — *Le Saint Graal*, ed. Hucher, 1875. — The prose *Joseph of Arimathea*, ed. G. Weidner, 1881. — The prose *Merlin*, ed. Paris et Ulrich, 1886. — Gautier d'Arras, *Eracle*, ed. Löseth, 1890; *Ille et Galeron*, ed. Löseth, 1890, ed. Foerster, 1891. — André le Chapelain, *Andreae capellani regii Francorum de amore libri tres*, ed. Trojel, Copenhagen, 1892. — *Dares* and *Dictys*, ed. F. Meister, 1872 and 1873. — Benoît de Sainte-More, *le Roman de Troie*, ed. Constans, 1904. — *Enéas*, ed. Salverda de Grave, 1891. — *Le Roman de Thèbes*, ed. Constans, 1890. — *Floire et Blanchefleur*, ed. E. du Méril, 1856. — *Aucassin et Nicolete*, ed. Suchier, 1903.

CHAPTER IV

Jeanroy, *les Origines de la poésie lyrique en France au moyen-âge*, 1889. — G. Paris, *les Origines de la poésie lyrique en France au moyen-âge*, in *Journal des Savants*, 1889–1892. — P. Paris, *les Chansonniers*, in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, Vol. XXIII, 1856. — G. Raynaud, *Bibliographie des chansonniers français des XIIIe et XIVe siècles*, 1884. — P. Meyer, *De l'influence des troubadours sur la poésie des peuples romans*, in *Romania*, Vol. V. — Bartsch, *Romanzen und Pastourellen*, 1870. — L. F. Mott, *The System of Courtly Love studied as an introduction to the "Vita Nuova" of Dante*, Boston, 1896.— L. Clédat, *Rutebeuf*, 1891. — A. Stimming, *Provenzalische Literatur*, in Gröber's *Grundriss*. — Diez, *Die Poesie der Troubadours*, revised by Bartsch, 1883. — Diez, *Leben und Werke der Troubadours*, revised by Bartsch, 1882. — P. Meyer, *Des rapports de la poésie des trouvères avec celle des troubadours* in *Romania*, Vol. XIX. — J. Anglade, *les Troubadours*, 1909. — J. H. Smith, *The Troubadours at Home*, New York, 1899. — Faral, *les Jongleurs*, cf. supra, Chap. I. — P. S. Allen, *Mediæval Mimes*, in *Modern Philology*, 1910. — E. du Méril, *Poésies populaires latines du moyen-âge*, 1847. — Hubatsch, *Die lateinischen Vagantenlieder*, 1870. — C.-V. Langlois, *la Littérature goliardique*, in *Revue bleue*, 1892–1893. — T. Wright, *Latin Poems attributed to Walter Mapes*, 1841. — *Carmina Burana*, Stuttgart, 1847. — W. Meyer, *Fragmenta Burana*, 1901. — J. A. Symonds, *Wine, Women and Song*, London, 1884. — G. Huet, *Sur l'origine du poème de Phyllis et Flora*, in *Romania*, Vol. XXII.

CHAPTER V

See references to historical implements in the General Bibliography: Potthast, Chevalier, and especially Molinier. — G. Monod, *Etude critique sur les sources de l'histoire carolingienne*, in *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes*, 1898. — *Vie de saint Alexis*, ed. Paris et Pannier, 1872. — Förster, *le Tombeur de Notre Dame*, in *Romania*, Vol. II. See English translation by Wicksteed, *Our Lady's Tumbler*. — A. Debidour, *les Chroniqueurs*, 1892. —Paris et Jeanroy, *Extraits des chroniqueurs Français*, 1892. —Villehardouin, *Conquête de Constantinople*, ed. Natalis de Wailly, 1874. — Joinville, *Vie de saint Louis*, ed. N. de Wailly, 1875. — On Jean le Bel, W. P. Ker, *Froissart*, in *Essays on Medieval Literature*, 1905. — Mme Darmsteter, *Froissart*, 1894. — Works of Froissart: Ed. Luce et Raynaud, nine vols., 1869–1894; Poems, ed. Scheler, 1871; *Méliador*, ed. Longnon, 1900. English translations by Lord Berners and by Thomas Johnes. — Works of Commines: Ed. Dupont, 1840; ed. Chantelauze, 1881.

CHAPTER VI

Hervieux, *les Fabulistes latins*, 1893–1894. See also G. Paris in *Journal des Savants*, 1884–1885. — Jacobs, *The Fables of Æsop; I, History of the Æsopic Fable*, London, 1889. — A. Joly, *Marie de France et les fables au moyen-âge*, in *Mémoires de l'Académie de Caen*, 1863. — *Die Fabeln der Marie de France*, ed. Warnke, 1898. — Lenient, *la Satire en France au moyen-âge*, 1877. — Rothe, *les Romans du Renard, examinés, analysés et comparés*, 1845. — Fauriel, *le Roman de Renart*, in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, Vol. XXII, 1852. — Potvin, *le Roman du Renard*, 1861. — P. Paris, *les Aventures de maître Renart et d'Ysengrin, son compère*, 1861. — Jonckbloet, *Etude sur le Roman du Renart*, 1863. — E. Martin, *Observations sur le Roman de Renart*, 1887. — Sudre, *les Sources du Roman de Renart*, 1893. — G. Paris, *le Roman de Renard*, in *Journal des Savants*, 1894–1895. — Willems, *Etude sur l'Ysengrinus*, 1895. — *Roman de Renart*, ed. Martin, 1882–1887. — Houdoy, *Renart-le-Nouvel*, 1874. — Edition of *Renard le Contrefait* in preparation by G. Raynaud. — J. Bédier, *les Fabliaux*, second ed., 1895. — J.-V. Le Clerc, *les Fabliaux*, in *Hist. litt. de la France*, Vol. XXIII. — C.-V. Langlois, *les Fabliaux*, in *Revue bleue*, 1891. — Brunetière, *les Fabliaux en France au moyen-âge*, in *Etudes critiques*, Vol. VI. — Montaiglon et Raynaud, *Recueil général et complet des fabliaux des XIIIe et XIVe siècles*, 1872–1890.

CHAPTER VII

See the titles on the mediæval theatre in the General Bibliography, especially Petit de Julleville and Creizenach. — G. Cohen, *Histoire de la mise en scène dans le théâtre religieux français du moyen-âge*, 1906. — D. C. Stuart, *The Development of Stage Decoration in France in the Middle Ages*, New York, 1910. — L. Gautier, *les Tropes*, 1887. — Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, 1860. — Petit de Julleville, *la Comédie et les mœurs en France au moyen-âge*, 1886. — Petit de Julleville, *les Comédiens en France au moyen-âge*, 1885. — J. P. Jacobsen, *la Comédie au moyen-âge*, in *Revue de philologie française*, 1900. — H. Guy, *Adam de le Hale*, 1898. — Monmerqué et Michel, *le Théâtre français au moyen-âge*, 1839. — *Recueil de farces, moralités et sermons joyeux*, ed. Le Roux de Lincy et Michel, 1837. — *Le Jeu de Robin et Marion*, ed. E. Langlois, 1896. — *Miracles de Notre Dame*, ed. G. Paris et Robert, 1876–1893. — Ed. Fournier, *le Théâtre français avant la Renaissance. Mystères, moralités, farces*, 1872. — Text of mediæval plays in Viollet le Duc's *Ancien théâtre français*, Vols. I–III. — E. Picot, *la Sotie en France*, in *Romania*, Vol. VII; E. Picot, *les Monologues dramatiques*, in *Romania*, Vols. XV, XVI, XVII; E. Picot, *les Moralités polémiques*, in *Bulletin de la Soc. hist. Protestantisme*, 1887, 1892, 1906. — E. Picot, *Recueil général des soties*, 1902 ff. — Oulmont, *Gringore*, 1911. — Gringore, *Œuvres*, 2 vols., 1858. — *Recueil de farces*, ed. Picot et Nyrop, 1880. — *Pathelin*, ed. 1904 (Soc. des textes modernes); 1908 (F. E. Schneegans).

CHAPTER VIII

H. O. Taylor, *The Mediæval Mind*, 1911. — Gröber, *Uebersicht über die lateinische Literatur*, in Gröber's *Grundriss*. — M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 1911. — Ueberweg-Heinze, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, Part II, ninth edition, 1898. See especially the bibliographies. — B. Hauréau, *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique*, 1872–1880. — F. Picavet, *la Scolastique*, in *Revue internationale de l'enseignement*, 1893. — F. Picavet, *Esquisse d'une histoire générale des philosophies médiévales*, 1904. — M. de Wulf, *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale*, Louvain, 1900. — W. Turner, *History of Philosophy*, Boston, 1903. — Kaulich, *Geschichte der scholast. Philosophie*, 1863. — Stöck, *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, 1864–1866. — Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande*, 1861–1870. — Townsend, *Great Schoolmen of the Middle Ages*, 1881. — R. Lane-Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought*, 1884. — Saint-René Taillandier, *Scot Erigène et la philosophie scolastique*, 1843. — Alice Gardner, *John the Scot*, London, 1890. — R. W. Church, *Saint Anselm*, London, 1870. — R. S. Storrs, *Bernard of Clairvaux*, London, 1894. — Vacandard, *Vie de saint Bernard*, 1897. — F. Picavet, *Roscelin, philosophe et théologien*, 1911. — E. Michaud, *Guillaume de Champeaux*, 1868. — Ch. de Rémusat, *Abélard*, 1845. — Vaughan, *Thomas of Aquino*, 1871–1872. — Eicken, *Geschichte und system der mittelalterl. Weltanschauung*, 1887. — Gierke, *Political Theories of the Middle Ages* (English translation), 1900. — Langlois, *la Vie en France au moyen-âge d'après quelques moralistes du temps*, 1908. — C.-V. Langlois, *la Connaissance de la nature et du monde au moyen-âge, d'après quelques contes français à l'usage des laïcs*, 1911. — J. B. Schwab, *Johannes Gerson*, 1858. — A.-L. Masson, *Jean Gerson*, 1894. — Abbé Lafontaine, *Jehan Gerson (1363–1429)*, 1906. — Tschakert, *Peter von Ailli*, 1877. — Henri d'Andeli, *Œuvres*, ed. Héron, 1881.

CHAPTER IX

J. E. Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, Vol. I, Cambridge, Eng., 2nd ed. 1906. — Denifle, *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400*, 1885. — H. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, Oxford, 1895. — Thurot, *De l'organisation de l'enseignement dans l'Université de Paris au moyen-âge*, 1850. — Luquet, *Aristote et l'Université de Paris au XIIIe siècle*, in *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des hautes études, sciences religieuses*, 1904. — A. O. Norton, *Mediæval Universities*, Cambridge, Mass., 1909. — Paetow, *Arts Courses at Mediæval Universities*, in *Pub. of the Univ. of Illinois*, 1910. — Mâle, *l'Art religieux du treizième siècle en France*, 1902. — Schaarschmidt, *Johannes Saresberiensis*, 1862. — John of Salisbury, new edition of the *Policraticus*, edited by Webb, Oxford, 1909. — Espenberger, *Die Philosophie des Petrus Lombardus*, 1901. — M. Baumgartner, *Die Philosophie des Alanus de Insulis*, 1896. — Daunou, *Vincent de Beauvais*, in *Hist. litt. de la*

France, Vol. XVIII. — Bourgeat, *Vincent de Beauvais*, 1856. — Boutaric, *Vincent de Beauvais et la connaissance de l'antiquité classique au XIIIe siècle*, in *Revue des questions historiques*, 1875. — Lecoy de la Marche, *la Chaire française au moyen-âge*, 1868. — L. Bourgain, *la Chaire française au XIIe siècle*, 1879. — Walberg, *le Bestiaire de Philipe de Thaün*, 1900. — Lauchert, *Geschichte des Physiologus*, 1889. — L. Pannier, *les Lapidaires français du moyen-âge*, 1882. — Lanson, *Un naturaliste au XIIIe siècle* (Jean de Meun), in *Revue bleue*, 1894. — E. Langlois, *Origines et sources du Roman de la Rose*, 1890. — Editions of the *Roman de la Rose:* Méon, 1814; Michel, 1864; Marteau, 1878–1880. English translation in verse by F. S. Ellis, London, n. d.

CHAPTER X

Le Clerc et Renan, *Discours sur l'état des lettres et des beaux-arts au XIVe siècle*, 1865. — J.-P. Charpentier, *Histoire de la Renaissance des lettres au XVe siècle*, 1833. — Guillaume de Machault, *le Livre du Voir Dit*, ed. P. Paris, 1875; *Prise d'Alexandrie*, ed. Mas Latrie, 1877; *Œuvres*, ed. Hoepffner, 1908; ed. Chichmaref, 1909. — Sarradin, *Eustache Deschamps*, 1879; E. Hoepffner, *Eustache Deschamps*, 1904; *Œuvres*, ed. Saint-Hilaire et Raynaud, 1878–1894. — Petit de Julleville, Reports of lectures on Charles d' Orléans, Villon, Martin Lefranc, in *Bulletin des Cours et Conférences*, 1894–1895; on the literature of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in *Revue des Cours et Conférences*, 1895–1896. — F. Meunier, *Nicole Oresme*, 1857. — E. Bridrey, *Nicole Oresme, étude d'histoire des doctrines et des faits économiques*, 1906. — A. Thomas, *De Joannis de Monsterolio vita et operibus*, 1884. — A. Thomas, *le Nom et la famille de Jehan de Monstereul*, in *Romania*, Vol. XXXVII, 1908. — A. Piaget, *Martin Le Franc*, Lausanne, 1888. — Robineau, *Christine de Pisan*, 1882. — F. Koch, *Leben und Werke der Christine de Pisan*, 1885. — R. Thomassy, *Essai sur les écrits politiques de Christine de Pisan*, 1838. — F. Beck, *les Epîtres sur le Roman de la Rose von Christine de Pisan*, 1889. — Piaget, *Christine de Pisan et le Roman de la Rose*, in *Etudes romanes dédiées à Gaston Paris*, 1891. — Christine de Pisan, *Œuvres poétiques*, ed. Roy, 1886 ff; *Chemin de long étude*, ed. Püschel, 1881. — Delaunay, *Etude sur Alain Chartier*, 1876. — G. Joret-Desclosières, *Alain Chartier*, 1897. — Hannappel, *Die Poetik Chartiers*, 1881. — Chartier, *Œuvres*, ed. Duchesne, 1617; *le Curial*, ed. Heuckenkamp, 1899. — Beaufils, *Etude sur la vie et les poésies de Charles d'Orléans*, 1861. — P. Champion, *Vie de Charles d'Orléans*, 1911. — Charles d'Orléans, *Œuvres*, ed. Champollion-Figeac, 1842; ed. d'Héricault, 1874. — Campaux, *François Villon*, 1859. — Longnon, *Etude biographique sur Villon*, 1877. — G. Paris, *François Villon*, 1901. — Villon, *Œuvres*, ed. Longnon, 1892. English translation in verse by John Payne, London, 1892. — Doutrepont, *la Littérature à la cour des ducs de Bourgogne*, 1909. Söderhjelm, *la Nouvelle française au XVe siècle*, 1910.

PART II

GENERAL

See the titles mentioned under the General Bibliography, and also: L. Feugère, *Caractères et portraits littéraires*, 1849. — A. Vinet, *Moralistes des XVIe et XVIIe siècles*, 1859. — A. Desjardins, *les Sentiments moraux au XVIe siècle*, 1887. — Lenient, *la Satire en France au XVIe siècle*, 1866. — A. H. Upham, *The French Influence in English Literature from the Accession of Elizabeth to the Restoration*, New York, 1908. — Sidney Lee, *The French Renaissance in England*, London, 1910. — P. Toldo, *Etudes sur la poésie burlesque de la Renaissance*, in *Zeitsch. für rom. Philologie*, Vol. XXV. — Montaiglon et Rothschild, *Recueil de poésies françaises des XVe et XVIe siècles*, 13 vols., 1855–1878. — W. Pater, *Gaston de Latour* (an unfinished romance), London, 1896.

CHAPTER I

J. A. Symonds, *The Renaissance in Italy*, London, 1877 ff. — Burckhardt, *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien*, revised by Geiger, 1885 (French and English translations). — P. Schaff, *The Renaissance*, New York, 1891. — Ph. Monnier, *le Quattrocento, étude sur le XVe siècle littéraire italien*, 1901. — E. Gebhart, *les Origines de la Renaissance en Italie*, 1879. — J. Texte, *les Origines de la Renaissance française*, in *Revue des Cours et Conf.*, 1893–1894. — Rathery, *Influence de l'Italie sur les lettres françaises depuis le XIIIe siècle jusqu'au règne de Louis XIV*, 1853. — F. Flamini, *Le Lettere italiane alla corte di Francesco I*, in *Studi di storia letteraria italiana e straniera*, 1895. — J. Texte, *l' Influence italienne dans la Renaissance française*, in *Etudes de litt. européenne*, 1898. — R. de Maulde La Clavière, *Louise de Savoie et François Ier, trente ans de jeunesse*, 1895. — E. Picot, *les Français italianisants au XVIe siècle*, 1906–1907. —H. Hauvette, *Alamanni, sa vie et son œuvre*, 1903. — P. Laumonier, *Luigi Alamanni, son influence sur la Pléiade française*, in *Rev. de la Renaissance*, 1903.

CHAPTER II

G. Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums*, revised by Lehnerdt, 1893. — Sandys, *Harvard Lectures on the Revival of Learning*, Cambridge, England, 1905 (see, above, the same author's *History of Classical Scholarship*). — H. T. Peck, *History of Classical Philology*, New York, 1911. — P. de Nolhac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme*, second edition, 1907. — J. Philippe, *Introduction de l'imprimerie à Paris*, 1892. — A. Claudin, *Histoire de l'imprimerie*, 1900–1904. — Massebieau, *les Colloques scolaires du XVIe siècle*, 1878. — W. H. Woodward, *Studies in Education during the Age of the Renaissance*, Cambridge, England, 1906. — *Roberti Gaguini Epistolæ et*

Orationes, ed. Thuasne, 1904. — J. Paquier, *l'Humanisme et la Réforme: J. Altandre*, 1900. — Geiger, *Fausto Andrelini*, in *Vierteljahrschrift für Kultur und Litteratur der Renaissance*, No. 1, (1885). — E. Egger, *l'Hellénisme en France*, 2 vols., 1869. — E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique des XVe et XVIe siècles*, 1885–1906. — A. Lefranc, *Histoire du Collège de France*, 1892. — Van der Haeghen, *Bibliotheca Erasmiana*, Ghent, 1907. — Erasmus, *Epistles*, translated by F. M. Nichols, London, 1901–1904. — H. Durand de Laur, *Erasme, précurseur et initiateur de l'esprit moderne*, 1872. — G. Feugère, *Erasme*, 1874. — J. A. Froude, *The Life and Letters of Erasmus*, 1894. — Rebitté, *Guillaume Budé*, 1846. — L. Delaruelle, *Guillaume Budé*, 1907. (See Le Fèvre, in *Revue de synthèse historique*, 1907.) — L. Delaruelle, *Répertoire analytique et chronologique de la correspondance de Guillaume Budé*, 1907. — R. C. Christie, *Estienne Dolet*, 2d edition, London, 1899. — Lenient, *De bello Ciceroniano apud recentiores*, 1855. — R. Sabbadini, *Storia del Ciceronianismo*, 1886.

CHAPTER III

See General Bibliography, especially Guy, *Hist. de la poésie au XVIe siècle*. — G. Pellissier, *De sexti decimi saeculi in Francia artibus poeticis*, 1882. — E. Langlois, *De artibus rhetoricae rhythmicae*, 1890. — E. Langlois, *Recueils d'Arts de seconde Rhétorique*, 1902. — Hecq et Paris, *La poétique française au moyen-âge et à la renaissance*, Brussels, 1896. — H. Chatelain, *Recherches sur le vers français au XVe siècle*, 1908. — Samouillan, *Olivier Maillard*, 1891. — G. Pérouse, *Georges Chastellain, étude sur l'histoire politique et littéraire du XVe siècle*, 1910. — A. de la Borderie, *Jean Meschinot*, in *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 1895. — Meschinot, *les Lunettes des Princes*, ed. O. de Gourcuff, 1890. — F. Thibaut, *Marguerite d'Autriche et Jehan Lemaire de Belges*, 1888. — Ph.-Aug. Becker, *Jean Lemaire, der erste humanistische Dichter Frankreichs*, 1893. — Ph.-A. Becker, *Nachträge zu Jean Lemaire*, in *Zeitsch. für rom. Phil.*, Vol. XIX. — Lemaire de Belges, *Œuvres*, ed. Stecher, 4 vols., Louvain, 1882–1891. — H. Molinier, *Octovien de Saint-Gelais*, 1911. — Ehrlich, *Jean Marots Leben und Werke*, 1902. — Ch. d'Héricault, Introduction to *Œuvres choisies de Marot*, 1867. — H. Morley, *Clement Marot, and other Studies*, 1871. — E. Scherer, *Marot* in *Etudes sur la littérature contemporaine*, Vol. VIII. — O. Douen, *Clément Marot et le Psautier Huguenot*, 1878. — H. Guy, *De fontibus Clementi Maroti poetae: antiqui et medii aevi scriptores*, 1898. — E. Voizard, *De disputatione inter Marotum et Sagontum*, 1885. — P. Bonnefon, *le Différend de Marot et de Sagon*, in *R. d'hist. litt. de la France*, 1894. — Marot, *Œuvres*, ed. Lenglet-Dufresnoy (Gordon de Percel), 4 and 6 vols., 1731; ed. Lacroix, 1824; ed. Jannet, 4 vols, 1868–1872 (the most convenient); ed. Guiffrey, 1876–1881 (the best, but incomplete, only Vols. II and III). — E. Rodocanachi, *Renée de France*, 1896. — Torraca, *Gl'Imitatori stranieri di Jacopo Sannazaro*,

Rome, 1882. — H. Molinier, *Mellin de Saint-Gelais*, 1911. — L. Delaruelle, *Un dîner littéraire chez Mellin de Saint-Gelais*, in *R. d'hist. litt. de la France*, Vol. IV. — Saint-Gelais, *Œuvres*, ed. Blanchemain, 3 vols., 1873.

CHAPTER IV

Bourciez, *les Mœurs polies et la littérature de cour sous Henri II*, 1883. — A. Lefranc, *le Platonisme en France à l'époque de la Renaissance* (1500–1550), in *Revue d'hist. litt. de la France*, 1896. — R. de Maulde La Clavière, *les Femmes de la Renaissance*, 1898. — On Platonic love, see Saint-Marc Girardin, *Cours de littérature dramatique*, Vol. II. — J. A. Symonds, *The Conception of Love in Plato and Dante*, in *Contemporary Review*, 1890. — E. Baret, *De l'Amadis de Gaule*, 1873. — A. Farinelli, *Dante e la Francia*, 1908. — A. Mary F. Robinson, *Marguerite of Angoulême* (also French edition by the same, Mme Darmsteter), 1899. — A. Lefranc, *Marguerite de Navarre et le Platonisme de la Renaissance*, in *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 1897–1898. — A. Lefranc, *les Idées religieuses de Marguerite de Navarre*, 1898. — E. Paturier, *les Sources du mysticisme de Marguerite de Navarre*, in *Revue de la Renaissance*, Vols. V and VI. — Marguerite de Navarre, *Les Marguerites de la Marguerite des Princesses*, ed. F. Frank, 4 vols., 1873; *l'Heptaméron*, ed. F. Frank, 3 vols., 1879; *l'Heptaméron*, ed. Le Roux de Lincy and Montaiglon, 4 vols., 1880; *les Dernières poésies de Marguerite de Navarre*, ed. A. Lefranc, 1896 (cf. review by G. Paris in *Journal des savants*, 1896). — F. Brunetière, *Un précurseur de la Pléiade, Maurice Scève*, in *Études critiques*, Vol. VI. — A. Baur, *Maurice Scève et la Renaissance lyonnaise*, 1905. — Maurice Scève, *Délie*, 1862. — Pernette du Guillet, *Rimes*, 1864. — A. Cartier, *les Poètes de Louise Labé*, in *Revue d'hist. litt. de la France*, 1894. — Louise Labé, *Œuvres*, ed. Boy, 2 vols., 1887. — Héroët, *Œuvres poétiques*, ed. Gohin, 1909. — Gilles Corrozet, *le Conte du rossignol*, in *Anciennes poésies fr.* (A. de Montaiglon), Vol. VIII.

CHAPTER V

Revue des Études Rabelaisiennes, quarterly since 1903. — V.-L. Bourrilly, *Etat présent des travaux sur Rabelais*, in *Rev. hist. mod. et contemp.*, 1906. — H. Schneegans, *Der heutige Stand der Rabelaisforschung*, in *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, Vol. I., 1909. — P. Plan, *Bibliographie Rabelaisienne* (*1532–1711*), 1904. — E. Gebhart, *Rabelais, la Renaissance et la Réforme*, 1877. — P. Stapfer, *Rabelais*, 1889. — R. Millet, *Rabelais*, 1892. — C. Whibley, *Literary Portraits*, London, 1904. — A. Tilley, *François Rabelais*, 1907. — J. Fleury, *Rabelais et ses œuvres*, 1877. — A. Heulhard, *Rabelais, ses voyages en Italie, son exil à Metz*, 1891. — L. Thuasne, *Études sur Rabelais*, 1904. — F. Plattard, *l'Œuvre de Rabelais*, 1910. — L. Thuasne, *Villon et Rabelais*, 1911. — F. Arnstädt, *Rabelais und sein Traité d'éducation*, 1872. — A. Lefranc, *les Navigations de Pantagruel*, 1905. — A. Tilley,

Rabelais and Geographical Discovery, in *Mod. Lang. Review*, Vol. II. — E. Huguet, *Etude sur la syntaxe de Rabelais*, 1894. — Works of Rabelais: Variorum edition, Esmangart and Johanneau, 9 vols., 1823–1826; Burgaud des Marets et Rathery, 2 vols., 1857; Montaiglon et Lacour, 3 vols., 1868–1872; P. Jannet, 7 vols., 1873–1874; Marty-Laveaux, 6 vols., 1868–1903; Moland, 1 vol., 1881; in preparation, *Ed. de la Soc. des Etudes Rabelaisiennes*, MM. Lefranc, Boulenger, Clouzot, Dorveaux, Plattard, Sainéan, about 8 vols. — Translations: Urquhart and Motteux, first complete edition, 1708, often reprinted; W. F. Smith, London, 1893. The German translation of Gottlob Regis contains voluminous notes. — H. Schneegans, *Geschichte der grotesken Satire*, 1894. — P. Toldo, *Contributo allo studio della novella francese del XV e XVI secolo*, 1895 (cf. G. Paris in *Journal des savants*, 1895.) — A. Chenevière, *Bonaventure des Périers, sa vie et ses poésies*, 1885. — Des Périers, *Œuvres*, ed. Lacour, 1856; *Cymbalum mundi*, ed. Frank, 1873. — S. Rabinowitz, *Guillaume Bouchet; ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der französischen Novelle*, 1910. — G. Bouchet, *les Sérées*, ed. Roybet, 6 vols., 1873–1882. — N. du Fail, *Propos rustiques*, ed. A. de la Borderie, 1878; *Contes et discours d'Eutrapel*, ed. Hippeau, 2 vols., 1875; *Baliverneries et contes d'Eutrapel*, ed. Courbet, 2 vols., 1894. — Béroalde de Verville, *le Moyen de parvenir*, ed. Royer, 2 vols., 1896.

CHAPTER VI

Delitiae C. poetarum Gallorum, collectore Ranutio Ghero (J. Gruter), 3 vols., Francfort, 1608. — Hamon, *Jean Bouchet*, 1901. — C. Jugé, *Jacques Peletier du Mans*, 1907. — H. Chamard, *De Jacobi Peletarii Cenomanensis Arte Poetica*, 1900 (cf. P. Laumonier in *Revue de la Renaissance*, Vol. I). — Peletier, *Art poétique*, 1555. — Peletier du Mans, *Œuvres poétiques*, ed. Séché and Laumonier, 1904. — L. Pinvert, *Lazare de Baïf*, 1900. — On the composition of the Pléiade cf. A. Tilley in *Mod. Lang. Review*, April, 1911. — Binet, *Vie de Ronsard*, ed. Laumonier, 1910. — P. de Nolhac, *le Dernier amour de Ronsard*, in *Nouvelle Revue*, 1882. — L. Mellerio, *Lexique de Ronsard*, 1895. — Laumonier, *Tableau chronologique des œuvres de Ronsard*, 1911. — Ronsard, *Œuvres*, ed. Blanchemain, 8 vols., 1857–1867 (text of 1560); ed. Marty-Laveaux, 6 vols., 1887–1893 (text of 1584); a critical edition announced by Laumonier for the Société des textes modernes. — *Les Amours de P. de Ronsard*, ed. Vaganay, 1910. — H. Chamard, *Joachim du Bellay*, 1900. — Sainte-Beuve, *Du Bellay* in *Nouveaux lundis*, Vol. XIII. — W. Pater, *Du Bellay*, in *Studies in the History of the Renaissance*. — P. Villey, *les Sources italiennes de la Défense*, 1908. — L. Le Bourgo, *De J. Bellaii latinis poematis*, 1903. — Du Bellay, *Œuvres*, ed. Marty-Laveaux, 2 vols., 1866–1867; ed. Chamard, (Soc. des textes modernes), in course of publication; *Défense et Illustration*, ed. Person, 1878; ed. Chamard, 1904; ed. Séché, 1905. — P. de Nolhac, *Lettres de Du Bellay*, 1883. — *J. Bellaii poematum libri quatuor*,

1558. — Augé-Chiquet, *Jean-Antoine de Baïf*, 1909. — E. Frémy, *Un précurseur de l'Académie française, l'Académie des derniers Valois*, 1887. — H. Nagel, *Das Leben J.-A. de Baïfs* in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Spr. und Litt.*, Vol. LX. — H. Nagel, *Die Werke J.-A de Baïfs*, in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Spr. und Litt.*, Vol. LXI. — E. S. Ingraham, *The Sources of les Amours of J.-A. de Baïf*, Univ. of Pennsylvania dissertation, 1906. — Baïf, *Œuvres*, ed. Marty-Laveaux, 5 vols., 1881–1890; *les Mimes*, ed. Blanchemain; 1880; *les Amours*, ed. Augé-Chiquet, 1909. — P. Robiquet, *De J. Aurati vita*, 1887. — Dorat, *Œuvres*, ed. Marty-Laveaux, 1875. — A. Jeandet, *Pontus de Tyard*, 1860. — Pontus de Thyard, *Œuvres*, ed. Marty-Laveaux, 1875. — H. Wagner, *Remy Belleau und seine Werke*, 1890. — Belleau, *Œuvres*, ed. Gouverneur, 3 vols., 1867; ed. Marty-Laveaux, 2 vols., 1877–1878. — Jodelle, *Œuvres*, ed. Marty-Laveaux, 2 vols., 1868–1870. — Rosenbauer, *Die poetischen Theorien der Plejade*, 1895. — H. Zschalig, *Die Verslehren von Fabri, Du Pont und Sibilet*, 1884. — Sebillet, *Art poétique*, ed. Gaiffe, 1910. — C. Dejob, *Marc-Antoine Muret*, 1881 (cf. review by P. de Nolhac in *Revue critique*, June 19, 1883. Name should be "de Muret"). — Mark Pattison, on Muretus, in collected *Essays*, London, 1889. — A. Hamon, *De Scaevolae Sammarthani vita et latine scriptis operibus*, 1901. — Longuemare, *les Sainte-Marthe*, 1902. — H. Hartmann, *Guillaume des Autels*, 1908. — C. Jugé, *Nicolas Denisot du Mans*, 1907. — Marc-Claude de Buttet, *Œuvres poétiques*, ed. Jacob, 2 vols., 1880.

CHAPTER VII

Marty-Laveaux, *la Langue de la Pléiade*, 2 vols., 1896–1898. — A. Couat, *la Poésie alexandrine*, 1882. — Faguet, *l'Alexandrinisme*, in *Propos littéraires*, Vol. II, 1904. — J. Voigt, *Das Naturgefühl in der Litteratur der französischen Renaissance*, 1898. — M. Jasinski, *Histoire du sonnet en France*, 1903. — Vaganay, *le Sonnet en Italie et en France au XVIe siècle*, 1903. — P. Laumonier, *Ronsard poète lyrique*, 1909. — H. Guy, *les Sources françaises de Ronsard*, in *Revue d'hist. litt. de la France*, 1902. — Gandar, *Ronsard considéré comme imitateur de Pindare et d'Homère*, 1854. — Vianey, *le Modèle de Ronsard dans l'ode pindarique*, in *Revue des langues romanes*, 1900. — Delboulle, *Anacréon et les poèmes anacréontiques avec les traductions et imitations du XVIe siècle*, 1891. — Stemplinger, *Das Fortleben der Horazischen Lyrik seit der Renaissance*, 1906. — J. A. Symonds, *The Pathos of the Rose*, in *Essays Speculative and Suggestive*, London, 1890 (cf. H. Guy, *"Mignonne, allons voir si la rose,". . . Réflexions sur un lieux commun* in *Revue philomathique*, 1902; Joret, *la Rose dans l'antiquité et au moyen-âge*, 1892). — Lange, *Ronsards Franciade und ihr Verhältniss zu Virgils Aeneide*, 1887. — Vianey, *l'Arioste et la Pléiade*, in *Bulletin Italien*, 1901. — Piéri, *Pétrarque et Ronsard*, 1895. — Vianey, *le Pétrarquisme en France*, 1909. — Vianey, *l'Arioste et les Discours de Ronsard*, in *Revue universitaire*, 1903. — Perdrizet, *Ronsard et la Réforme*, 1902. — J. Favre, *Olivier de Magny*, 1885.

— O. de Magny, *Œuvres*, ed. Courbet, 6 vols., 1871–1881. — H. Chardon, *la Vie de Tahureau*, 1885. — Tahureau, *Poésies*, ed. Blanchemain, 2 vols. 1870. — J. Tahureau, *Dialogues*, ed. Conscience, 1871. — A. Jamyn, *Œuvres*, ed. Brunet, 2 vols., 1879. — Desportes, *Œuvres*, ed. Michiels, 1858. — A. Lang, *Ballads and Lyrics of Old France*, verse translations, London, 1872. — C. H. Page, *Songs and Sonnets of P. de Ronsard*, verse translations, Boston, 1903. — G. Wyndham, *Ronsard and la Pléiade*, verse translations, London, 1906.

CHAPTER VIII

W. E. H. Lecky, *The Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe*, London, 1886. — Dr. M. Broussais, *Ambroise Paré, sa vie, son œuvre*, 1900. — S. Paget, *A. Paré and his Times*, 1897. — E. Dupuy, *Bernard Palissy*, 1902. — Cougny, *Pibrac, sa vie, ses écrits*, 1869. — Pibrac, *Quatrains*, ed. Claretie, 1874. — Waddington, *Ramus*, 1855. — J. Owen, *Ramus*, in *The Skeptics of the French Renaissance*, 1893. — Dupré-Lasale, *Michel de L'Hospital avant son élévation au poste de Chancelier de France*, 1875–1899. — L. Clément, *H. Estienne et son œuvre française*, 1898. — L. Feugère, *Essai sur Estienne*, 1853 (republished in *Caractères et portraits littéraires*). — Mark Pattison, on Estienne, in collected *Essays*, London, 1889. — G. Traccomaglia, *Contributo allo studio dell' italianismo in Francia*, Vol. I (H. Estienne e gli italianismi), 1907. — Works of Estienne: *Traité de la conformité du français avec le grec*, ed. Feugère, 1853; *Apologie pour Hérodote*, ed. Ristelhuber, 2 vols., 1879; *Dialogues du langage français italianisé*, ed. Ristelhuber, 2 vols., 1885; *Précellence du français*, ed. Huguet, 1896. — L. Feugère, *Essai sur Etienne Pasquier*, in his edition of *Œuvres choisies*, 1849. — Wenderoth, *E. Pasquiers Poetische Theorien und sein Thätigkeit als Literar-historiker;* cf. Herrig's *Archiv*, Vol. CXII. — Dupont, *De Stephani Pasquerii latinis carminibus*, 1898. — Becker, *Loys Le Roy*, 1896. — A. de Blignières, *Amyot, et les traductions françaises du XVIe siècle*, 1851. — R. Sturel, *Amyot traducteur des Vies Parallèles de Plutarque*, 1909.

CHAPTER IX

W. Cloetta, *Beiträge zur Litteratur-Geschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*, 1890–1892. — A. Ebert, *Entwickelungs-Geschichte der franz. Tragödie*, 1856. — Creizenach, *Geschichte des neuren Dramas*, 4 vols., 1893–1910. — E. Faguet, *la Tragédie en France au XVIe siècle*, 1883. — G. Bapst, *Essai sur l'histoire du théâtre en France*, 1893. — J. W. Cunliffe, *Early French Tragedy in the light of recent Scholarship*, in *Journal of Comp. Literature*, 1903. — G. Lanson, *les Origines de la Tragédie classique en France*, in *Rev. hist. litt. de la France*, 1903. — Haraszti, *la Littérature dramatique au temps de la Renaissance*, in *Rev. hist. litt. de la France*, 1909. — G. Lanson, *l'Idée de la Tragédie avant Jodelle*, in *Rev. hist. litt. de la France*, 1904. — E. Rigal, *la Mise en scène dans les tragédies du XVIe siècle*, in *Rev. hist. litt.*

de la France, 1905. (Reprinted in *De Jodelle à Molière.*) — Böhm, *Einfluss Senecas auf die in der zeit von 1552 bis 1562 erschienenen Tragödien*, 1902. — Massebieau, *De Ravisii Textoris Comoediis*, 1878. — Vodoz, *le Théâtre latin de Ravisius Textor*, Winterthur, 1898. — P. Hume Brown, *George Buchanan, Humanist and Reformer*, 1890. — D. Macmillan, *George Buchanan*, Edinburgh, 1906. — *George Buchanan*, Glasgow Quartercentenary Studies, 1907. — J. E. Spingarn, *History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance*, second edition, 1908. — J. Ebner, *Beitrag zu einer Geschichte der dramatischen Einheiten in Italien*, 1898. — G. Saintsbury, *A History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe*, 1900–1904. — E. Lintilhac, *De J.-C. Scaligeri Poetica*, 1887; cf. by the same, *Un Coup d'Etat dans la République des lettres*, in *Nouvelle Revue*, 1890. — S. Hoffmann, *Die Dramen Jodelles*, in Herrig's *Archiv*, Vol. LII. — J. de la Péruse, *Œuvres poétiques*, ed. Gellibert des Séguins, 1867. — L. Pinvert, *Jacques Grévin*, 1899. — J. Grévin, *César*, ed. Collischonn, 1886. — Baguenault de Puchesse, *Jean et Jacques de la Taille*, 1899. — A. Werner, *Jean de la Taille und sein Saül le furieux*, 1908. — Jean de la Taille, *Œuvres*, ed. R. de Maulde, 4 vols., 1882. — Bernage, *Robert Garnier*, 1880. — H. Chardon, *R. Garnier*, 1905. — Schmidt-Wartenburg, *The Influence of Seneca on Garnier*, Cornell dissertation, 1888. — C. Searles, *The Stageability of Garnier's Tragedies*, in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, Vol. XXII. — R. Garnier, *Œuvres*, ed. Foerster, 4 vols., 1882–1884. — A. Joly, *Antoine de Montchrêtien*, 1865. — G. Lanson, *Antoine de Montchrestien*, in *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, 1891 (or in *Hommes et livres*, 1895). — Montchrestien, *Œuvres*, ed. Petit de Julleville, 1891; *la Reine d'Ecosse*, édition critique par les élèves de l'Ecole Normale, 1905. — E. Chasles, *la Comédie en France au XVIe siècle*, 1862. — A. Baschet, *les Comédiens italiens à la cour de France*, 1882. — P. Toldo, *la Comédie française de la Renaissance*, in *Rev. hist. litt. de la France*, Vols. IV and V. — E. Rigal, *les Personnages conventionnels de la comédie au XVIe siècle*, in *Rev. hist. litt. de la France*, 1897. (Reprinted in *De Jodelle à Molière.*) — M. Sand, *Masques et bouffons*, 2 vols., 1860. — O. Fest, *Der miles gloriosus in der französischen Komödie*, 1897. — J. Macgillivray, *Life and Works of P. Larivey*, Leipzig, 1889. — G. Wenzel, *Pierre de Lariveys Komödien und ihr Einflus auf Molière*, in Herrig's *Archiv*, 1889. — Viollet Le Duc, *Ancien théâtre français*, 10 vols., 1854–1857. — E. Fournier, *Le Théâtre français au XVIe et XVIIe siècles*, 1871.

CHAPTER X

Sayous, *les Ecrivains français de la Réformation*, 1881. — H. Hauser, *Etudes sur la Réforme française*, 1909. — Graf, *la Vie et les écrits de Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples*, Strasbourg, 1842 (see also, Graf, *Jacobus Faber Stapulensis*, in *Zeitsch. für die historische Theologie*, 1852). — J. Barnaud, *Jacques Le Fèvre d'Etaples, son influence sur les origines de la Reformation française*, 1900. — Bevan, *Vie de Guillaume Farel*, 1885. — Ph. Godet, *P. Viret*, 1896. — Barnaud, *Pierre Viret*, 1911. — Bungener, *Calvin, sa vie, son œuvre et*

ses écrits, 1863. — A. Lefranc, *la Jeunesse de Calvin*, 1888. — Doumergue, *Jean Calvin*, 1897–1911. — W. Walker, *John Calvin*, New York, 1906. — *Johannis Calvini Opera quae supersunt omnia*, ed. Baum, Cunitz and Reutz, 59 vols., 1863–1900, (Corpus Reformatorum). Bibliography, Vol. LIX. — A. Erichson, *Bibliographia Calviniana*, 1900. — Calvin, *Institution de la religion chrétienne*, ed. Lefranc et Chatelain, 1911. — H. M. Baird, *Théodore de Bèze*, New York, 1900. — Maigron, *De Theodori Bezae poemaatis*, 1898. — Théodore de Bèze, *Abraham sacrifiant*, in Crapelet, *Poésies des XVe et XVIe siècles*, 1830–1832. — Bèze, *Juvenilia*, ed. Marchand, 1879. — H. Becker, *Louis des Mazures*, in *R. de la Renaissance*, Vol. I. — Louis des Masures, *Tragédies saintes*, ed. Comte, 1907. — G. Pellissier, *la Vie et les œuvres de Du Bartas*, 1882. — H. Ashton, *Du Bartas en Angleterre*, 1908. — P. Weller, *Sylvesters englische Uebersetzungen der religiösen Epen des Du Bartas*, 1902. — Postansque, *Théodore Agrippa d'Aubigné*, 1854. — Réaume, *Etude historique et littéraire sur A. d'Aubigné*, 1883. — Sainte-Beuve, *D'Aubigné*, in *C. du lundi*, Vol. X. — H. C. Macdowall, *D'Aubigné*, in *Henry of Guise and other portraits*, 1898. — W. Winckler, *Th.-A. d'Aubigné als Dichter*, 1906. — H. Pergameni, *la Satire au XVIe siècle et les Tragiques d'Agrippa d'Aubigné*, 1881. — Van Bever, *D'Aubigné, essai de bibliographie*, in *Bull. soc. hist. protestantisme*, 1905. — D'Aubigné, *Œuvres* (without the *Hist. univ.*), ed. Réaume et de Caussade, 6 vols., 1873–1892; *Histoire universelle*, ed. De Ruble, 9 vols., 1886; *les Tragiques*, ed. Lalanne, 1857; *les Tragiques*, ed. Read, 1872; *les Tragiques, Livre I*, critical ed. Bourgin, Foulet, Garnier, Maître, Vacher, 1896; *le Baron de Fœneste*, ed. Mérimée, 1855.

CHAPTER XI

On recent literature about Montaigne, see two articles by V.-L. Bourrilly in *Rev. d'hist. moderne*, 1907. — Sainte-Beuve, *Montaigne*, in *C. du lundi*, Vol. IV, and *Nouveaux lundis*, Vols. II and III. — Brunetière, Essay on Montaigne in *Etudes critiques*, Vol. VIII. — T. Malvezin, *Michel de Montaigne, son origine et sa famille*, 1875. — P. Bonnefon, *Montaigne et ses amis*, 1892. — P. Bonnefon, *Montaigne, l'homme et l'œuvre*, 1893. — Stapfer, *Montaigne*, 1895. — P. Stapfer, *la Famille et les amis de Montaigne*, 1896. — M. F. Lowndes, *Montaigne*, 1898. — G. Guizot, *Montaigne*, 1899. — E. Champion, *Introduction aux Essais de Montaigne*, 1900. — E. Dowden, *Michel de Montaigne*, 1905. — F. Strowski, *Montaigne*, 1906. — F. Strowski, *De Montaigne à Pascal*, 1907. — V. Giraud, *les Époques de la pensée de Montaigne*, in *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, 1909. — Miss Grace Norton, *The Early Writings of Montaigne* and *Studies in Montaigne*, 2 vols., New York, 1904. — Miss Grace Norton, *Montaigne*, Boston, 1908; *The Spirit of Montaigne*, Boston, 1908. — P. Villey, *les Sources et l'évolution des Essais de Montaigne*, 1908. — P. Villey, *les Livres d'histoire moderne utilisés par Montaigne*, 1908. — P. Laumonier, *Montaigne précurseur du XVIIe siècle*, in *Rev. hist. litt. de la France*, Vol. III. — Feis, *Shakespeare and Montaigne*, London,

1884. — J. M. Robertson, *Montaigne and Shakespeare*, 1909. — Villey, *l'Influence de Montaigne sur Locke et Rousseau*, 1911. — J. Texte, *la Descendance de Montaigne, Sir Thomas Browne*, in *Et. de litt. européenne*, 1898. — F. Dieckow, *John Florios englische Uebersetzung der Essais Montaignes, und Lord Bacons, Ben Jonsons und Robert Burtons Verhältniss zu Montaigne*, 1903. — *Œuvres*: Ed. Leclerc, 5 vols., 1826–1828; ed. Louandre, 4 vols., 1865–1866 (éd. variorum); ed. Dezeimeris et Barckhausen, 2 vols., 1870 (text of 1580, two books); ed. Motheau et Jouaust, 7 vols., 1886 (text of 1586, additions of 1595 in footnotes); ed. Courbet et Royer, 5 vols., 1872–1899 (text of 1595); ed. Strowski (édition municipale de Bordeaux), 4 vols., 1906 ff. (reprint of Bordeaux copy). *Journal de voyage*, ed. d'Ancona, 1889; ed. Lautrey, 1906. — Translations, by John Florio, 1603, and Charles Cotton, 1685, both frequently reprinted. W. C. Hazlitt's edition is based on Cotton. *Journal de voyage*, translated by W. G. Waters, 3 vols., 1903. — E. Puech, *Maturin Cordier*, 1896. — Cougny, *Guillaume du Vair*, 1857. — R. Radouant, *Guillaume du Vair*, 1907.

CHAPTER XII

H. Harrisse, *le Président de Thou et ses descendants*, 1905.—V. L. Bourrilly, *Guillaume du Bellay*, 1904. — Courteault, *Blaise de Monluc*, 1907; Courteault, *Un cadet de Gascogne au XVIe siècle*, 1909. — Sainte-Beuve, *Monluc* in *C. du lundi*, Vol. XI. — Monluc, *Commentaires et lettres*, ed. de Ruble, 5 vols., 1864–1876; *Commentaires, édition critique*, P. Courteault, Vol. I, 1911. — H. Hauser, *François de la Noue*, 1892. — L. Lalanne, *Brantôme, sa vie et ses écrits*, 1896. — L. Pingaud, *Brantôme historien*, in *Revue des quest. hist.*, Vol. XIX. — Brantôme, *Œuvres*, ed. Lalanne (Soc. de l'hist. de France), 12 vols., 1864–1882; *Œuvres*, ed. Mérimée et Lacour, 11 vols., 1858–1892. — Ch. Merki, *la Reine Margot*, 1905. — Marguerite de Valois, *Mémoires et lettres*, ed. Guessard, 1842. — Pierre de l'Estoile, *Mémoires-Journaux*, ed. Brunet, Champollion, Halphen, Lacroix, Read, Tamizey de Larroque, Tricotel, 12 vols., 1875–1896. — Flint, *The History of the Philosophy of History*, Edinburgh, 1893. — J. N. Figgis, *Studies of Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius*, Cambridge, England, 1907. — K. Glaser, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der politischen Litteratur Frankreichs in der zweiten Hälfte des XVI Jahrhunderts*, in *Zeitsch. für franz. Sp. und Lit.*, Vols. XXXI–XXXIII. — E. Armstrong, *The Political Theory of the Huguenots*, in *Eng. Hist. Review*, 1889. — G. Weil, *les Théories sur le pouvoir royal en France pendant les guerres de religion*, 1892. — F. Méaly, *Origines des idées politiques libérales en France*, 1903. — R. Dareste, *Essai sur François Hotman*, 1850. — Dareste, *F. Hotman, d'après sa correspondance inédite*, in *Revue historique*, 1876. — Blocaille, *Etude sur Hotman, la Franco-Gallia*, 1902. — L. Feugère, *Etienne de la Boëtie*, 1845. — La Boétie, *Œuvres*, ed. Bonnefon, 1892. — P. Moussiegt, *Hotman et Duplessis-Mornay, Théories politiques des Réformés au XVIe siècle*, 1899. — A. Waddington, *l'Auteur des Vindiciae contra tyrannos*, in

Revue historique, Vol. LI, 1893. — H. Baudrillart, *Jean Bodin et son temps*, 1853. — Fournol, *Bodin prédécesseur de Montesquieu*, 1896. — J. Franck, *Zur Satyre Ménippée*, in *Zeitsch. für frans. Sp. und Lit.*, Vols. IV, V, and VI. Girard, *Passerat et la Satire Ménippée*, in *Revue historique*, Vol. XXIX. — *Satire Ménippée*, ed. Tricotel, 2 vols., 1877–1881.

PART III

GENERAL

See the titles mentioned in the General Bibliography, and also: Vinet, *Moralistes des seizième et dix-septième siècles*, 1859. — Prévost-Paradol, *Études sur les moralistes français*, 1865. — N.-M. Bernardin, *Hommes et mœurs du XVIIe siècle*, 1900. — L. Charlanne, *l'Influence française en Angleterre au XVIIe siècle*, 1906. — A. H. Upham, *The French Influence in English Literature*, New York, 1908.

CHAPTER I

F. Robiou, *Essai sur l'histoire de la littérature et des mœurs pendant la première partie du XVIIe siècle*, 1858. (Only one volume appeared). — Ch. Dejob, *De l'Influence du Concile de Trente sur la littérature et les beaux-arts chez les nations catholiques*, 1884. — Philippson, *la Contre-Révolution religieuse au XVIe siècle*, 1883. — Cournot, *Considérations sur la marche des idées dans les temps modernes*, 1872. — H. Vaschalde, *Olivier de Serres, sa vie et ses travaux*, 1886. — E. Jung, *Henri IV écrivain*, 1855. — Abbé Grente, *Jean Bertaut*, 1903. — Bertaut, *Œuvres*, ed. Chenevière, 1891. — J. Vianey, *Mathurin Regnier*, 1896. — H. Cherrier, *Bibliographie de M. Regnier*, 1884; H. Cherrier, *Notes bibliographiques sur Regnier*, in *Bulletin du bibliophile*, 1908. — Regnier, *Œuvres*, ed. Courbet, 1875; ed. Lacour, 1876; *Macette*, ed. Brunot, 1900. — E. von Mojsisovics, *Jean Passerat, sein Leben und seine Persönlichkeit*, 1907. — Passerat, *Œuvres*, ed. Blanchemain, 2 vols., 1880. — Abbé Féret, *le Cardinal Du Perron*, 1877. — Abbé Grente, *Quae fuerit in Card. Davy Du Perron vis oratorica*, 1903. — Lemercier, *Étude littéraire et morale sur les poésies de Jean Vauquelin de la Fresnaye*, 1889. — J. Vianey, *Vauquelin de la Fresnaie*, in *Revue des Univ. du midi*, 1895. — Korval, *l'Art poétique de Vauquelin de la Fresnaie und sein Verhältniss zu der Ars Poetica des Horaz*, Vienna, 1902. — Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, *les Diverses poésies*, ed. Travers, 1869; *Œuvres diverses*, ed. Travers, 1872; *Art poétique*, ed. Pellissier, 1885.

CHAPTER II

F. Brunetière, *l'Evolution des genres, la critique*, 1890. — E. Faguet, report of lectures on French literature (1600–1620) in *Rev. des Cours et Conf.*, 1893-1895. — Sainte-Beuve, *Malherbe*, in *Nouveaux lundis*, Vol. XIII. — Duc de

Broglie, *Malherbe*, 1897. — G. Allais, *Malherbe et la poésie française à la fin du XVIe siècle*, 1891. — F. Brunot, *la Doctrine de Malherbe, d'après son commentaire sur Desportes*, 1891. — Counson, *Malherbe et ses sources*, 1904. — Malherbe, *Œuvres*, ed. Lalanne, 5 vols., 1862. — C. Drouhet, *le Poète François Mainard*, 1909. — L. Arnould, *Racan*, 1896. — Racan, *Œuvres*, ed. Tenant de Latour, 2 vols., 1857. — M. Schiff, *Mlle de Gournay*, 1911. — Käthe Schirmacher, *Théophile de Viau*, 1897. — C. Garrisson, *Théophile et Paul de Viau*, 1899. — F. Lachèvre, *le Procès du poète Théophile de Viau*, 1909. — Théophile, *Œuvres*, ed. Alleaume, 2 vols., 1856. — Th. Gautier, *les Grotesques*, 1844. — Durand-Lapie, *Saint-Amant*, 1896. — Schönherr, *Saint-Amant*, in *Zeitsch. für franz. Sp. und Lit.*, Vol. X. — Saint-Amant, *Œuvres*, ed. Livet, 2 vols., 1855. — P. Brun, *Savinien de Cyrano Bergerac*, 1893. — H. Dübi, *Cyrano de Bergerac, sein Leben und seine Werke*, in Herrig's *Archiv*, Vols. CXIII and CXIV. — P. Juppont, *l'Œuvre scientifique de Savinien de Cyrano*, 1906. — Cyrano de Bergerac, *Œuvres diverses et facétieuses*, ed. Jacob, 1858; *les Histoires comiques des états et empires*, etc., ed. Jacob, 1858.

CHAPTER III

A. Bourgoin, *les Maîtres de la critique au XVIIe siècle*, 1887. — Sainte-Beuve, on Balzac, in *Port-Royal*, Vol. II. — H. Vogler, *Die literaturgeschichtlichen Kentnisse und Urteile des J.-L. Guez de Balzac*, 1906. — Declareuil, *les Idées politiques de Guez de Balzac*, 1908. — Balzac, *Œuvres choisies*, ed. Moreau, 2 vols., 1854. — Bourgoin, *Valentin Conrart*, 1883. — Pellisson et d'Olivet, *Histoire de l'Académie française*, edited by Livet, 1858. — P. Mesnard, *Histoire de l'Académie française*, 1857. — D. M. Robertson, *The French Academy*, London, 1910. — On Vaugelas, see Sainte-Beuve, *Nouveaux lundis*, Vol. VI. — Vaugelas, *Remarques*, ed. Chassang, 1880. — Fabre, *Chapelain et nos deux premières Académies*, 1890. — Mülhan, *Jean Chapelain, eine biographisch-kritische Studie*, 1894. — Fabre, *les Ennemis de Chapelain*, 1899. — G. Collas, *Jean Chapelain*, 1911.

CHAPTER IV

Rœderer, *Mémoire pour servir à l'histoire de la société polie en France*, 1835. — V. Cousin, *la Société française au XVIIe siècle d'après le Grand Cyrus*, 1858. — E. Faguet, report of lectures on Preciosity (1630–1660) in *Revue des Cours et Conf.*, 1895–1897. — Livet, *Précieux et Précieuses*, new ed., 1896. — Somaize, *le Dictionnaire des Précieuses*, ed. Livet, 1856. — V. Cousin, *la Jeunesse de Mme de Longueville*, 1853; *Mme de Longueville pendant la Fronde*, 1859. — F. Nunziante, *Il cav. Marino alla corte di Luigi XIII*, in *Nuova Antologia*, 1887. — C. W. Cabeen, *l'Influence de G.-B. Marino sur la littérature française de la première moitié du XVIIe siècle*, 1904. — A. Morel-Fatio, *Ambrosio de Salazar et l'étude de l'espagnol en France sous Louis XIII*,

1901. — G. Lanson, *Etudes sur les rapports de la littérature française et de la littérature espagnole au XVIIe siècle* (1600–1660), in *Revue d'hist. litt. de la France*, 1896, 1897, and 1901. — R. Kerviler, *Antoine Godeau*, 1879. — A. Cognet, *Godeau*, 1900. — H. G. Rahstede, *Wanderungen durch die französische Literatur: Vincent Voiture*, 1891. — E. Magne, *Voiture*, 1911. — Voiture, *Œuvres*, ed. Ubicini, 1855.

CHAPTER V

P. Morillot, *le Roman en France depuis 1610 jusqu'à nos jours*, 1892. — Körting, *Geschichte des französischen Romans, im XVII Jahrhundert*, 1885. — Lebreton, *le Roman au XVIIe siècle*, 1890. — Brunetière, *le Roman français au XVIIe siècle*, in *Et. critiques*, Vol. IV. — On French novel, see introd. of T. F. Crane's ed. of Boileau, *les Héros de roman*, Boston, 1902. — V. Cherbuliez, *l'Idéal romanesque en France de 1610 à 1816*, 1911. — G. Reynier, *le Roman sentimental avant l'Astrée*, 1908. — Waldberg, *Der empfindsame Roman in Frankreich*, 1906. — W. Küchler, *Zu den Anfängen des psychologischen Romans in Frankreich*, in Herrig's *Archiv*, 1909. — Saint-Marc Girardin, *Cours de littérature dramatique*, 1872. — N. Bonafous, *Etudes sur l'Astrée*, 1846. — B. Germa, *l'Astrée d'Honoré d'Urfé*, 1905. — Reure, *la Vie et les œuvres de Honoré d'Urfé*, 1910. — On d'Urfé, see report of lectures by A. Lefranc, in *Rev. des Cours et Conférences*, 1905. — Michaut, Notes on d'Urfé, in *Revue des Cours et Conférences*, July, 1909. — E. Montégut, *En Bourbonnais et en Forez*, 1880. — Charlotte Banti, *l'Aminta du Tasse et l'Astrée de d'Urfé*, 1895. — Saint-Marc Girardin, *Index de l'Astrée* in *Rev. hist. litt. de la France*, 1898. — R. Kerviler, *Marin Le Roy de Gomberville*, 1876. — H. Rigault, *Camus*, in Vol. IV of *Œuvres complètes*. — Abbé Boulas, *Camus, évêque de Belley*, 1879. — A. Bayer, *Jean Pierre Camus*, 1906. — R. Kerviler, *J. Ogier de Gombauld*, 1876. — Lydie Morel, *Jean Ogier de Gombauld*, Neufchâtel, 1910. — Rathery et Boutron, *Mlle de Scudéry*, 1872. — E. Roy, *la Vie et les œuvres de Charles Sorel*, 1891. — Ch. Sorel, *Histoire comique de Francion*, ed. Delahays, 1858. — P. Morillot, *Scarron et le génie burlesque*, 1888. — E. Magne, *Scarron et son milieu*, 1905. — H. Chardon, *la Troupe du Roman comique dévoilée*, 1876. — Boislisle, *P. Scarron et Françoise d'Aubigné*, 1894. — H. Chardon, *Scarron inconnu et les types des personnages du Roman comique*, 1904. — J. Duchesne, *Histoire des poèmes épiques du XVIIe siècle*, 1870. — R. Toinet, *Quelques recherches autour des poèmes héroïques ou épiques français du XVIIe siècle*, 1899 and 1907. — Père Delaporte, *le Merveilleux dans la littérature française sous le règne de Louis XIV*, 1891. — H. Chérot, *Etude sur la vie et les œuvres du P. Le Moyne*, 1887. — Abbé Vissac, *De la poésie latine au siècle de Louis XIV*, 1862. — V. Fournel, *la Littérature indépendante*, 1862. — P. Olivier, *Cent poètes lyriques, précieux ou burlesques du XVIIe siècle, morceaux choisis et notices*, 1898.

CHAPTER VI

E. Rigal, *le Théâtre français avant la période classique*, 1901. — E. Rigal, *De Jodelle à Molière*, 1911. — Despois, *le Théâtre français sous Louis XIV*, 1874. — G. Lanson, *le Théâtre classique au temps de Hardy*, in *Revue bleue*, 1891, or *Hommes et livres*, 1895. — E. Rigal, *Alexandre Hardy et le théâtre français à la fin du XVIe et au commencement du XVIIe siècle*, 1889. — A. Hardy, *Théâtre*, ed. Stengel, 1884. — Tabarin, *Œuvres*, ed. Aventin, 2 vols., 1858. — H. Breitinger, *les Unités d'Aristote avant le Cid de Corneille*, 1879, — Souriau, *De la convention dans la tragédie classique et dans le drame romantique*, 1885. — Dannheisser, *Zur Geschichte der Einheiten in Frankreich*, in *Zeitsch. für franz. Sp. und Lit.*, 1892. — Ch. Arnaud, *Etude sur la vie et les œuvres de l'abbé d'Aubignac*, 1887. — G. Bizos, *Etude sur la vie et les œuvres de Jean de Mairet*, 1877. — Mairet, *Silvanire*, ed. Otto, 1890; *Sophonisbe*, ed. Vollmöller, 1888; *Sylvie*, ed. Marsan, 1905; *Galanteries du duc d'Ossonne*, in Fournier's *le Th. Fr. au XVIe et au XVIIe siècle*. — F. Tenner, *Fr. Le Metel de Boisrobert als Dramatiker und Nachahmer des spanischen Dramas*, 1907. — E. Magne, *Le plaisant abbé de Boisrobert*, 1909. — K. Philip, *Pierre du Ryers Leben und dramatische Werke*, 1906. — N.-M. Bernardin, *Un précurseur de Racine: Tristan L'Hermite*, 1895. — E. Hofmann, *François Tristan L'Hermite*, 1898. — Tristan L'Hermite, *Théâtre*, ed. Girard, 1904–1907. — Fournel, *le Théâtre au XVIIe siècle, la comédie*, 1892. — E. Martinenche, *la Comedia espagnole en France de Hardy à Racine*, 1900. — Stiefel, *Die Nachahmung italienischer Dramen bei einigen Vorläufern Molières*, in *Zeitsch. für franz. Sp. und Lit.*, 1904. — R. Kerviler, *Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin*, 1879. — A. Reibetanz, *Jean Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin*, 1910. — Dannheisser, *Zur Geschichte des Schäferspiels in Frankreich*, in *Zeitsch. für franz. Sp. und Lit.*, 1889. — J. Marsan, *la Pastorale dramatique en France*, 1905. — H. Carrington Lancaster, *The French Tragi-Comedy* (1551–1628), Baltimore, 1907. — G. Reynier, *Thomas Corneille*, 1893. — Jean de Schelandre, *Tyr et Sidon* (text of 1608), ed. Haraszti, 1908; (text of 1628) in *Ancien Théâtre Français* of Viollet le Duc, Vol. VIII. — A. Batereau, *Georges de Scudéry als Dramatiker*, 1902. — W. Harvey Jellie, *les Sources du théâtre anglais à l'époque de la Restauration*, 1906.

CHAPTER VII

E. Picot, *Bibliographie Cornélienne*, 1876; Le Verdier et Pelay, *Additions à la Bibliographie Cornélienne*, 1908. — G. Lanson, *Corneille*, 1898. — Brunetière, *Corneille*, in *Etudes crit.*, Vol. VI. See also *les Epoques du théâtre français*. — P. H. Frye, *Corneille, the neo-classic tragedy and the Greek*, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1908. — On Corneille, see Lessing, *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, and Schlegel, *Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Literatur*. — E. Rigal, *Corneille et l'évolution de la tragédie en France*, in *Rev. des langues romanes*, 1895 (reprinted in *De Jodelle à Molière*). — Lisle, *Essai sur les*

théories dramatiques de Corneille, 1882. — J. Lemaître, *Corneille et la poétique d'Aristote*, 1888. — J. Boehm, *Die dramatischen Theorien Corneilles*, 1900. — J. Segall, *Corneille and the Spanish Drama*, New York, 1902. — Huszar, *Corneille et le théâtre espagnol*, 1903. — E. Deschanel, *le Romantisme des classiques*, 1883. — A. Gasté, *la Querelle du Cid* (documents), 1899. — D. F. Canfield, *Corneille and Racine in England*, New York, 1904. — Godefroy, *Lexique de la langue de Corneille*, 1862. — *Œuvres de Corneille*, ed. Marty-Laveaux, 12 vols., 1862–1868. — Rotrou, *Œuvres*, ed. Viollet le Duc, 1820. See T. F. Crane's ed. of *Saint-Genest* and *Venceslas*, Boston, 1907, with full introd. and bibliographies. — Jarry, *Essai sur les œuvres dramatiques de Jean de Rotrou*, 1868. — H. Chardon, *la Vie de Rotrou mieux connue*, 1884. — L. Person, *Histoire de Venceslas*, 1882. — L. Person, *Histoire du véritable Saint-Genest*, 1882. — Buchetmann, *Rotrous Antigone und ihre Quellen*, 1901. — Steffens, *J. de Rotrou als Nachahmer Lope de Vegas*, 1891. — Stiefel, *Unbekannte italienische Quellen Jean de Rotrous*, 1891. On the chronology of Rotrou's works, the same in *Zeitsch. für franz. Sp. und Lit.*, 1893, 1907; on his sources, the same writer, *ibid.*, 1901, 1906.

CHAPTER VIII

Liard, *Descartes*, 1881. — A. Fouillée, *Descartes*, 1893. — E. S. Haldane, *Descartes, his Life and Times*, London, 1905. — O. Hamelin, *le Système de Descartes*, 1910. — Krantz, *Essai sur l'esthétique de Descartes*, 1882. — G. Lanson, *le Héros cornélien et le Généreux selon Descartes*, in *Hommes et livres*, 1895. — G. Lanson, *l'Influence de Descartes dans la littérature française*, in *Revue de métaphysique*, 1896. — F. Bouillier, *Histoire de la philosophie cartésienne*, 1868. — Descartes, *Œuvres*, ed. Adam et Tannery, 1897 ff. in course of publication. — Perrens, *les Libertins en France au XVIIe siècle*, 1899. — R. Grousset, *Œuvres posthumes*, 1886. — Thomas, *la Philosophie de Gassendi*, 1889. — G. J. Brett, *The Philosophy of Gassendi*, London, 1908. — Jacques Denis, *Sceptiques ou libertins de la première moitié du XVIIe siècle: Gassendi, Gabriel Naudé, Gui-Patin, Lamothe-Levayer, Cyrano de Bergerac*, in the *Mémoires* of the Académie nationale des sciences, arts et belles-lettres of Caen, 1884. — P. Pic, *Guy Patin*, 1910. — Ollé-Laprune, *la Philosophie de Malebranche*, 1870. — H. Joly, *Malebranche*, 1901.

CHAPTER IX

A. Maulvault, *Répertoire alphabétique des personnes et des choses de Port-Royal*, 1902. — Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, fifth edition, 1888–1891. (In seven volumes with elaborate index.) — Racine, *Abrégé de l'histoire de Port-Royal*, ed. Gazier, 1909. — Dufossé, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de Port-Royal*, ed. Bouquet, 1876–1879. — E. Romanes, *The Story of Port-Royal*, 1907. — M. F. Lowndes, *The Nuns of Port-Royal*, 1909. — Abbé Fuzet, *les Jansénistes du XVIIe siècle, leur histoire et leur dernier historien, M. Sainte-*

Beuve, 1877. — Paquier, *le Jansénisme*, 1909. — Maynard, *Pascal*, 1850. — Nourrisson, *Pascal, physicien et philosophe*, 1885. — J. Bertrand, *Blaise Pascal*, 1891. — E. Boutroux, *Pascal*, 1900. — V. Giraud, *Pascal*, third edition, 1905. — V. Giraud, *Blaise Pascal, études d'histoire morale*, 1910. — Viscount St. Cyres, *Pascal*, 1909. — H. R. Jordan, *Pascal*, 1909. — Strowski, *Pascal et son temps*, 1907–1908. — Scherer, *la Religion de Pascal*, in *Etudes de litt. contemp.*, Vol. IX. — Droz, *le Scepticisme de Pascal*, 1886. — Sully Prudhomme, *La vraie religion selon Pascal*, 1905. — H. Petitot, *Pascal, sa vie religieuse*, 1911. — A. Gazier, *Les derniers jours de Pascal*, 1911. — *Œuvres*, ed. Brunschvicg (*Grands écrivains de la France*), in course of publication. *Provinciales*, ed. Molinier, 1891; ed. Faugère, 1886–1895. *Pensées*, ed. Faugère, 1844; ed. Havet, 1851; ed. Molinier, 1877; ed. Michaut (manuscript arrangement), 1896; ed. Brunschvicg (students' edition), 1897; ed. Gazier, 1906; *The Provincial Letters*, ed. De Soyres, Cambridge, England, 1880. — V. Cousin, *Jacqueline Pascal*, 1853.

CHAPTER X

F. Strowski, *Saint François de Sales. Introduction à l'histoire du sentiment religieux en France au XVIIe siècle*, 1898. — H. Chérot, *Saint François de Sales et la prédication au XVIIe siècle*, 1900. — Saint François de Sales, *Œuvres*, édition de la Visitation d'Annecy, in course of publication since 1892. — G. Compayré, *Histoire critique des doctrines de l'éducation en France depuis le XVIe siècle*, 1881. — Jourdain, *Histoire de l'Université de Paris au XVIIe et au XVIIIe siècle*, 1888. — Douarche, *l'Université de Paris et les Jésuites*, 1888. — E. Boysse, *le Théâtre des Jésuites*, 1880. — Nourisson, *le Cardinal de Bérulle*, 1859. — Lallemand, *l'Education dans l'ancien Oratoire de France*, 1898. — Mgr Perraud, *l'Oratoire en France*, 1865. — Carré, *les Pédagogues de Port-Royal*, 1887. — F. Cadet, *l'Education à Port-Royal*, 1887. — E. Paradis, *la Pédagogie janséniste comparée à la pédagogie catholique*, 1910. — G. Hodgson, *Studies in French Education from Rabelais to Rousseau*, Cambridge, England, 1908.

CHAPTER XI

A. Pereire, *Bibliographie Racinienne*, announced in 1911. — Taine, on Racine, in *Nouveaux essais de critique et d'histoire*, 1865. — P. Monceaux, *Racine*, 1892. — G. Larroumet, *Racine*, 1898. — J. Lemaître, *Jean Racine*, 1908. — P. Robert, *la Poétique de Racine*, 1890. — Le Bidois, *la Vie dans les tragédies de Racine*, 1901. — Steinweg, *Kompositionsstudien zu Racines Tragödien*, 1909. — G. Michaut, *la Bérénice de Racine*, 1907. — Deltour, *les Ennemis de Racine au XVIIe siècle*, 1859. — Abbé Delfour, *la Bible dans Racine*, 1893. — Brunetière, *les Ennemis de Racine*, in *Etudes critiques*, Vol. I. See also *les Epoques du théâtre français* and *Histoire et littérature*, Vol. II. — Masson-Forestier, *Autour d'un Racine inconnu*, 1911. — *Œuvres de Racine*,

ed. Mesnard, 8 vols., 2 albums, 1865–1870. — P. Janet, *les Passions et les caractères dans la littérature du XVIIe siècle*, 1888. — Hausding, *Campistron in seiner Bedeutung als Dramatiker*, 1903.

CHAPTER XII

Bibliography of Molière by Desfeuilles in Vol. XI of Despois et Mesnard edition, 1893; P. Lacroix, *Bibliographie Molièresque*, 1875; Currier and Gay, *Catalogue of Molière Collection in the Harvard Library*, 1906, (contains an index of Monval's *le Molièriste*, 10 vols., 1879–1889). — Mahrenholtz, *Molières Leben und Werke*, 1881. — G. Larroumet, *la Comédie de Molière*, 1887. — H. M. Trollope, *Molière*, London, 1905. — H. C. Chatfield-Taylor, *Life of Molière*, New York, 1906. — E. Rigal, *Molière*, 1908. — B. Matthews, *Molière*, New York, 1910. — M.-J. Wolff, *Molière, der Dichter und sein Werk*, 1910. — Brunetière, *Etudes critiques*, Vol. I (*Dernières recherches sur la vie de Molière*); Vol. IV, (*la Philosophie de Molière*); Vol. VII (*la Langue de Molière*); Vol. VIII (*les Epoques de la Comédie de Molière*). See also *les Epoques du théâtre français*, Chaps. IV and VI. — L. Moland, *Molière et la comédie italienne*, 1867. — S. Griswold Morley, *Notes on Spanish Sources of Molière*, in *Publications of Mod. Lang. Ass. of America*, Vol. XIX. — Martinenche, *Molière et le théâtre espagnol*, 1906. — Huszar, *Molière et l'Espagne*, 1907. — R. Allier, *la Cabale des Dévots*, 1902. — A. Rébelliau, *Un épisode de l'histoire religieuse du XVIIe siècle. La Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement et la contre-réformation catholique*, in *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, 1903; idem, *la Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement*, in *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, 1908. — G. de Grandmaison, *la Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement*, in *le Correspondant*, 1911. — Gendarme de Bévotte, *la Légende de Don Juan*, 1906. — D. H. Miles, *The Influence of Molière on Restoration Comedy*, New York, 1910. — Livet, *Lexique de la langue de Molière*, 1896–1897. — *Œuvres de Molière*, ed. Despois et Mesnard, 13 vols., 1873–1893; see also Livet's editions to certain separate plays, as *le Misanthrope*, *Tartuffe*, *le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, *les Femmes savantes*, etc. — V. Fournel, *les Contemporains de Molière* (texts), 3 vols., 1863–1875.

CHAPTER XIII

G. Lanson, *Boileau*, 1892. — Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits littéraires*, Vol. I; *Port-Royal*, Vol. VI; *Causeries du lundi*, Vol. VI. — Brunetière, article *Boileau* in the *Grande Encyclopédie*. — Brunetière, *l'Esthétique de Boileau*, in *Etudes crit.*, Vol. VI. — F. A. Geissler, *Die Theorien Boileaus*, 1909. — Revillout, *la Légende de Boileau* in *Rev. des langues romanes*, 1900–1905. — *Œuvres*, ed. Berriat Saint-Prix, 4 vols., 1830; ed. Gidel, 4 vols., 1873; ed. Pauly, 2 vols., 1891; see also *Dialogue des Héros de roman*, ed. Crane, Boston, 1902. — Merlet, *Saint-Evremond*, 1869. — L. Curnier, *Saint-Evremond*, 1875. — W. Melville Daniels, *Saint-Evremond en Angle-*

terre, 1907. — Saint-Evremond, Introduction to the Giraud ed. of *Œuvres choisies*, 1866. — H. Rigault, *Histoire de la querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*, 1859. — Brunetière, *l'Evolution des genres, la critique*, 1890. — On the quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns, see: Rigault, *Histoire de la querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*, 1859; Nisard, *Hist. de la litt. française;* Brunetière, *l'Evolution des genres, la critique*, chaps. IV and V, and his essays on *Descartes et la litt. fr., Jansénistes et Cartesiens, la Critique de Bayle, la Formation de l'idée de progrès*, in the various volumes of the *Etudes critiques*. — G. Saintsbury, *History of Criticism*, Edinburgh, 1900–1904. — On Charles Perrault see articles by P. Bonnefon in the *Revue hist. litt. de la France*, 1904, 1905, and 1906. — Doncieux, *le Père Bouhours*, 1886. — Th. Rosset, *Bouhours continuateur de Vaugelas*, and *Bouhours théoricien du style classique*, in *Annales de l'Université de Grenoble*, 1908.

CHAPTER XIV

Jacquinet, *les Prédicateurs du XVIIe siècle avant Bossuet*, 1885. — Hurel, *Orateurs sacrés à la cour de Louis XIV*, 1874. — Abbé Urbain, *Bossuet*, Bibliothèque des bibliographies critiques, 1900. — Abbé Verlaque, *Bibliographie raisonnée des œuvres de Bossuet*, 1908. — *Revue Bossuet*, 1900 ff. — Freppel, *Bossuet et l'éloquence sacrée au XVIIe siècle*, 1893. — G. Lanson, *Bossuet*, 1895. — Rébelliau, *Bossuet*, 1900. — Brunetière, *la Philosophie de Bossuet*, in *Etudes crit.*, Vol. V; article *Bossuet* in *la Grande Encyclopédie*, (or in *Etudes critiques*, Vol. VI). — Abbé Vaillant, *Etude sur les sermons de Bossuet*, 1851. — Gandar, *Bossuet orateur*, 1866. — Abbé Lebarq, *Histoire critique de la prédication de Bossuet*, 1888. — Abbé de la Broisse, *Bossuet et la Bible*, 1890. — Crouslé, *Fénelon et Bossuet*, 1894. — Abbé Bellon, *Bossuet, directeur de conscience*, 1895. — Rébelliau, *Bossuet, historien du protestantisme*, 1909. — E. Longuemare, *Bossuet et la société française sous le règne de Louis XIV*, 1910. — *Œuvres*, ed. Lebel (Versailles), 43 vols., 1815 ff.; ed. Lachat, 31 vols., 1862–1864; *Œuvres oratoires*, ed. abbé Lebarq, 6 vols., 1890–1896; *Correspondance*, ed. Urbain et Levesque, 1909 ff. — Bernus, *Richard Simon*, Lausanne, 1869. — Margival, *Essai sur Richard Simon*, 1900. — Griselle, *Bourdaloue*, Bibliothèque des bibliographies critiques, 1900. — *Revue Bourdaloue*, 1902–1904. — Sainte-Beuve, *Bourdaloue*, in *Causeries du lundi*, Vol. IX. — Brunetière, *Bourdaloue*, in *Etudes crit.*, Vol. VIII. — Belin, *la Société française au XVIIe siècle, d'après les sermons de Bourdaloue*, 1875. — A. Feugère, *Bourdaloue, sa prédication et son temps*, 1881. — Lauras, *Bourdaloue, sa vie et ses œuvres*, 1881. — De Ménorval, *la Vie d'un jésuite*, 1897. — H. Chérot, *Bourdaloue inconnu*, 1898. — Chérot, *Bourdaloue, sa correspondance et ses correspondants*, 1899. — E. Griselle, *Bourdaloue, histoire critique de sa prédication*, 1901. — Castets, *Bourdaloue, la vie et la prédication d'un religieux au XVIIe siècle*, 1901–1904. — *Œuvres*, ed. Guérin, 4 vols., 1864; ed. Delhomme et Briquet, 6 vols., 1900. — Lehanneur, *Mascaron*, 1878. — Brunetière, on Fléchier, in *Histoire et littérature*, Vol. III. — Abbé Fabre,

Fléchier orateur, 1885. — Brunetière, on Massillon, in *Etudes crit.*, Vol. II. — Ingold, *l'Oratoire et le Jansénisme au temps de Massillon*, 1880. — Pauthe, *Etudes religieuses, historiques et littéraires: Massillon, sa prédication sous Louis XIV et Louis XV*, 1908.

CHAPTER XV

Brunetière, article on Fénelon in *la Grande Encyclopédie;* also *Etudes crit.*, Vol. II. — Bausset, *Histoire de Fénelon*, 4 vols., 1808–1809. — Gosselin, *Histoire littéraire de Fénelon*, 1843. — P. Janet, *Fénelon*, 1892. — J. Lemaitre, *Fénelon*, 1910. — Boulvé, *De l'Hellénisme chez Fénelon*, 1898. — E. de Broglie, *Fénelon à Cambrai*, 1883. — Matter, *le Mysticisme en France au temps de Fénelon*, 1865. — Crouslé, *Fénelon et Bossuet*, 1894–1895. — Cagnac, *Fénelon, directeur de conscience*, 1901. — A. Delplanque, *Fénelon et la doctrine de l'amour pur*, 1907. — Cagnac, *Fénelon, études critiques*, 1909. — E. Griselle, *Fénelon, études historiques*, 1911. — *Revue Fénelon*, 1910 ff. — *Œuvres*, ed. Gosselin et Caron, 22 vols., 1820 ff.; *Correspondance*, 11 vols., 1827–1829; *Table*, 1 vol., 1830. — Guerrier, *Madame Guyon, sa vie, ses doctrines et son influence*, 1881. — T. C. Upham, *Madame Guyon*, New York, 1858.

CHAPTER XVI

E. Gosse, *The Love Letters of a Portuguese Nun*, in *Seventeenth-Century Studies*, 1897. — A. Barine, *la Jeunesse de la Grande Mademoiselle*, 1902. — A. Barine, *Louis XIV et la Grande Mademoiselle*, 1905. — A. Renée, *les Nièces de Mazarin*, 1858. — L. Pérey, *le Roman du grand Roi, Louis XIV, et Marie Mancini*, 1894. — V. Cousin, *Mme de Sablé*, 1854. — Aubenas, *Histoire de Madame de Sévigné*, 1842. — Sainte-Beuve, on Mme de Sévigné, in *Portraits de femmes; Causeries du lundi*, Vol. I; *Nouveaux lundis*, Vol. I. — G. Boissier, *Madame de Sévigné*, 1887. — Vallery-Radot, *Madame de Sévigné*, 1889. — *Lettres de Mme de Sévigné*, ed. Monmerqué et Mesnard, 14 vols. and album, 1862–1866; *Lettres inédites*, ed. Capmas, 2 vols., 1876. — Comte d'Haussonville, *Madame de La Fayette*, 1881. — Taine, on Mme de la Fayette, in *Essais de critique et d'histoire*, 1858. — Duc de Noailles, *Histoire de Mme de Maintenon*, 1848. — Geffroy, *Mme de Maintenon d'après sa correspondance*, 1887. — Haussonville et Hanotaux, *Souvenirs sur Mme de Maintenon*, 1902–1905. — Read, *la Petite-fille d'Agrippa d'Aubigné*, in *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du protestantisme*, Vols. XXVI and XXXVII. — Gréard, *l'Education des femmes par les femmes*, 1886. — Rousselot, *Histoire de l'éducation des femmes en France*, 1883. — Sainte-Beuve, *Madame Deshoulières*, in *Portraits de femmes*.

CHAPTER XVII

A. Franz, *Das literarische Porträt in Frankreich im Zeitalter Richelieus und Mazarins*, 1905. — Mlle Samfiresco, *Ménage polémiste, philologue, poète*, 1902. — De Gournay, *Huet, évêque d'Avranches*, 1855. — Mark Patti-

son, on Huet, in collected *Essays*, 1889. — Hatin, *Histoire politique et littéraire de la presse en France*, 1859. — Hatin, *Bibliographie historique et critique de la presse périodique française*, 1866. — F. Roubaud, *Théophraste Renaudot*, 1856. — E. Hatin, *Théophraste Renaudot*, 1883. — Gilles de la Tourette, *Théophraste Renaudot*, 1884. — J. Loret, *la Muse historique*, ed. Ravenel, de Pelouse, and Livet, 4 vols., 1857–1878. — *Les Continuateurs de Loret*, ed. Rothschild, 2 vols., 1881–1888. — O. Langheim, *De Visé, sein Leben und seine Dramen*, 1903. — Sainte-Beuve, on the Chevalier de Méré, *Portraits littéraires*, Vol. III. — D. Zevaco, *l'Honnête homme au XVIIe siècle*, in *Rev. de phil. franç. et de litt.*, Vol. XXV. — M. Topin, *le Cardinal de Retz*, 1863. — A. Gazier, *les Dernières années du Cardinal de Retz*, 1875, — Chantelauze, *le Cardinal de Retz et l'affaire du chapeau*, 1878. — Retz, *Œuvres*, ed. Feillet, Gourdault et Chantelauze, 10 vols., 1870 ff. — E. Gérard-Gailly, *Bussy-Rabutin, sa vie, ses œuvres et ses amies*, 1909. — Sainte-Beuve, on Bussy-Rabutin, *Causeries du lundi*, Vols. III and XIII. — Tallemant des Réaux, *Historiettes*, 10 vols., 1840. — Bourdeau, *La Rochefoucauld*, 1895. — *Œuvres de La Rochefoucauld*, ed. Gilbert et Gourdault, 3 vols., 1868–1883. — P. Morillot, *La Bruyère*, 1904. — H. G. Rastede, *Ueber La Bruyère und seine Charaktere*, 1886. — E. Allaire, *La Bruyère dans la maison de Condé*, 1886. — Lange, *La Bruyère critique des conditions et des institutions sociales*, 1909. — *Œuvres de La Bruyère*, ed. Servois, 3 vols., 1865–1878. — G. Boissier, *Saint-Simon*, 1892. — Sainte-Beuve, on Saint-Simon, *Causeries du lundi*, Vols. III and XV, *Nouveaux lundis*, Vol. X. — Taine, on Saint-Simon, in *Essais de critique et d'histoire*. — Chéruel, *Saint-Simon considéré comme historien de Louis XIV*, 1865. — E. Pilastre, *la Religion au temps du duc de Saint-Simon*, 1909. — *Œuvres de Saint-Simon*, ed. Chéruel, 20 vols., 1856–1858; ed. Chéruel et Régnier, 22 vols., 1873–1886; ed. Boislisle, in course of publication, 1879 ff.

CHAPTER XVIII

Sainte-Beuve, on La Fontaine, in *Portraits littéraires*, Vol. I, and *Causeries du lundi*, Vol. VII. — H. Taine, *La Fontaine et ses fables*, 1853. — Walckenaër, *Histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de La Fontaine*, 1858. — Saint-Marc Girardin, *La Fontaine et les fabulistes*, 1867. — E. Faguet, *La Fontaine*, 1889. — G. Lafenestre, *La Fontaine*, 1895. — P. de Rémusat, *La Fontaine naturaliste*, in *Rev. des Deux-Mondes*, 1869; Doutrepont, *La Fontaine naturaliste*, in *Zeitsch. für franz. Sp. und Lit.*, 1896. — *Œuvres de La Fontaine*, ed. Girard, Desfeuilles, Régnier and Mesnard, 11 vols., 1883–1893. — Brédif, *Segrais, sa vie et ses ouvrages*, 1863. — A. Gasté, *Notes sur Segrais*, 1887.

PART IV

CHAPTER I

Barni, *Histoire des idées morales et politiques en France au XVIIIe siècle*, 1866. — Aubertin, *l'Esprit public au XVIIIe siècle*, 1873. — Brunel, *les Philosophes et l'Académie française au XVIIIe siècle*, 1884. — Lévy-Bruhl, *History of Modern Philosophy in France*, Chicago, 1899. — G. Boissier, *l'Académie française sous l'ancien régime*, 1909. — Brunetière, *les Philosophes et la Révolution française*, in *Histoire et littérature*, Vol. I. — Brunetière, *la Formation de l'idée de progrès*, in *Etudes crit.*, Vol. V. — Brunetière, *Etudes sur le XVIIIe siècle*, 1911. — Crouslé, *Lessing et le goût français en Allemagne*, 1863. — Danckelmann, *Batteux*, Rostock, 1902. — Lanfrey, *l'Eglise et les philosophes au XVIIIe siècle*, 1857. — F. Rocquain, *l'Esprit révolutionnaire avant la Révolution*, 1878. — H. Sée, *les Idées philosophiques du XVIIIe siècle et la littérature prérévolutionnaire*, in *Revue de synthèse historique*, 1903. — H. Sée, *Revue générale de l'histoire des idées politiques en France, XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*, in *Revue de synthèse historique*, 1903. — M. Roustan, *les Philosophes et la société française au XVIIIe siècle*, 1906. — Lanson, *Origines et premières manifestations de l'esprit philosophique dans la littérature française*, in *Rev. des Cours et Conferences*, 1908–1909 and 1909–1910. — A. Lecoq, *la Question sociale au XVIIIe siècle*, 1909. — J. Delvaille, *Essai sur l'histoire de l'idée de progrès jusqu'à la fin du XVIIIe siècle*, 1910. — A. Sayous, *le Dix-huitième siècle à l'étranger*, 1861. — Joret, *Des rapports intellectuels de la France avec l'Allemagne avant 1789*, 1884. — Süpfle, *Geschichte des deutschen Kultureinflusses auf Frankreich*, 1886. — Rossel, *Histoire des relations littéraires entre la France et l'Allemagne*, 1897. — Texte, *Rousseau et les origines du cosmopolitisme littéraire*, 1895. See also articles in *Revue des Cours et Conférences* (1895–1896), and in Petit de Julleville's *Littérature française*, Vol. VI.

CHAPTER II

Fr. Puaux, *les Précurseurs français de la tolérance*, 1881. — Sainte-Beuve, on Bayle, in *Portraits littéraires*, Vol. I. — Lenient, *Etude sur Bayle*, 1855. — Brunetière, on Bayle, in *Etudes critiques*, Vol. V. — Betz, *P. Bayle und die Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, 1896. — L. Dubois, *Bayle et la tolérance*, 1902. — W. Bolin, *P. Bayle, sein Leben und seine Schriften*, 1905. — A. Cazes, *P. Bayle*, 1905. — Delvolvé, *Essai sur P. Bayle*, 1906. — Laborde-Milaà, *Fontenelle*, 1905. — Maigron, *Fontenelle*, 1906.

CHAPTER III

E. et J. de Goncourt, *la Femme au XVIIIe siècle*, 1877. — Feuillet de Conches, *les Salons de conversation au dix-huitième siècle*, 1882. — Sainte-Beuve, *Madame de Lambert*, in *Causeries du lundi*, Vol. IV. — E. de Broglie,

les Mardis et les mercredis de la marquise de Lambert, in *le Correspondant*, 1895. — Sainte-Beuve, *la Duchesse du Maine*, in *Causeries du lundi*, Vol. III. — A. Barine, *Princesses et grandes dames* (duchesse du Maine), 1907. — Général de Piépape, *la Duchesse du Maine*, 1910. — M. Masson, *Mme de Tencin*, 1909. — L. Perey, *le Président Hénault et Mme du Deffand*, 1893. — Lion, *le Président Hénault*, 1903. — Sainte-Beuve, *Abbé Galiani*, in *Causeries du lundi*, Vol. II. — P. de Ségur, *le Royaume de la rue Saint-Honoré: Mme Geoffrin et sa fille*, 1897. — P. de Ségur, *Julie de Lespinasse*, 1906. — Sainte-Beuve, *Mademoiselle Aïssé*, in *Portraits littéraires*, Vol. IV. — Sainte-Beuve, *Cardinal de Bernis*, in *Causeries du lundi*, Vol. VIII. — F. Funck-Brentano et d'Estrées, *les Nouvellistes*, 1905. — Funck-Brentano et P. d'Estrées, *Figaro et ses devanciers*, 1909.

CHAPTER IV

Dutrait, *Etude sur la vie et les œuvres de Crébillon*, 1895. — Deschanel, *le Théâtre de Voltaire*, 1886. — Holzhausen, *Die Lustspiele Voltaires* 1888. — H. Lion, *les Tragédies et les théories dramatiques de Voltaire*, 1896. — J.-J. Ollivier, *Voltaire et les comédiens interprètes de son théâtre*, 1900. — Jusserand, *Shakespeare en France sous l'ancien régime*, 1899. (There is an English edition.) — Lounsbury, *Voltaire and Shakespeare*, New York, 1902.

CHAPTER V

L. Fontaine, *le Théâtre et la philosophie au XVIIIe siècle*, 1878. — J. Lemaître, *la Comédie après Molière et le théâtre de Dancourt*, 1882. — Desnoiresterres, *la Comédie satirique au XVIIIe siècle*, 1885. — Lenient, *la Comédie au XVIIIe siècle*, 1888. — G. Lanson, *la Comédie au XVIIIe siècle*, in *Hommes et livres*, 1895. — Toldo, *Etudes sur le théâtre de Regnard*, in *Revue d'hist. litt. de la France*, 1904–1905. — Barberet, *Lesage et le théâtre de la Foire*, 1887. — Campardon, *les Spectacles de la Foire (1595–1791)*, 1877. — M. Albert, *les Théâtres de la Foire*, 1900. — N.-M. Bernardin, *la Comédie italienne et le théâtre de la Foire*, 1902. — O. Klinger, *Die Comédie italienne in Paris nach der Sammlung von Gherardi*, 1902. — G. Lanson, *Nivelle de La Chaussée et la comédie larmoyante*, 1887. — F. Gaiffe, *Etude sur le drame en France au XVIIIe siècle*, 1910. — Font, *Essai sur Favart*, 1894. — R. Rolland, *l'Opéra avant l'Opéra*, in *Revue de Paris*, 1904. — E. Schuré, *Histoire du drame musical*, 1907. — E. Guieysse-Frère, *Sedaine, ses protecteurs et ses amis*, 1907. — Günther, *l'Œuvre dramatique de Sedaine*, 1908. — P. Chaponnière, *Piron*, 1910.

CHAPTER VI

Lebreton, *le Roman au XVIIIe siècle*, 1898. — L. Claretie, *Lesage romancier*, 1890. — Lintilhac, *Lesage*, 1893. — Brunetière, on Lesage, *Etudes crit.*, Vol. III. — G. Lanson, *Etude sur Gil Blas*, in *Hommes et livres*, 1895. —

J. Fleury, *Marivaux et le marivaudage*, 1881. — Larroumet, *Marivaux*, 1882. — G. Deschamps, *Marivaux*, 1897. — Brunetière, on Marivaux, *Etudes crit.*, Vols. II and III; *Epoques du théâtre français*. — H. Harrisse, *l'Abbé Prévost*, 1896. — Schroeder, *l'Abbé Prévost*, 1899. — Brunetière, on the abbé Prévost, *Etudes critiques*, Vol. III.

CHAPTER VII

Caro, *la Fin du dix-huitième siècle*, 1880. — Vian, *Histoire de Montesquieu*, 1878. — Brunetière, on Montesquieu in *Etudes crit.*, Vols. I and IV; *Questions de critique*, Vol. I. — A. Sorel, *Montesquieu*, 1887. — Zévort, *Montesquieu*, 1887. — H. Barckhausen, *Montesquieu, ses idées et ses œuvres*, 1907. — Faguet, *Politique comparée de Montesquieu, Voltaire et J.-J. Rousseau*, 1902. — J. Dedieu, *Montesquieu et la tradition politique anglaise en France*, 1909. — Churton Collins, *Voltaire, Montesquieu and Rousseau in England*, 1908. — Braunschvicg, *l'Abbé Dubos rénovateur de la critique au XVIIIe siècle*, 1904. — Ferté, *Rollin*, 1902. — J. Barni, *les Moralistes français au XVIIIe siècle*, 1873. — Paléologue, *Vauvenargues*, 1890. — Sainte-Beuve, on Vauvenargues, *Causeries du lundi*, Vols. III and XIV. — John Morley, *Critical Miscellanies*, 1886. — P. Nebel, *Vauvenargues' Moral-Philosophie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Stellung zur französischen Philosophie seiner Zeit*, 1907.

CHAPTER VIII

Bengesco, *Bibliographie des œuvres de Voltaire*, 1882–1890. — G. Desnoiresterres, *Voltaire et la société au XVIIIe siècle*, 1867–1876. — J. Morley, *Voltaire*, 1874. — J. Parton, *Life of Voltaire*, Boston, 1881. — J. Mahrenholtz, *Voltaires Leben und Werke*, 1885. — E. Champion, *Voltaire*, 1892. — Faguet, *Voltaire*, 1894. — Nourrisson, *Voltaire et le Voltairianisme*, 1896. — K. Schirmacher, *Voltaire*, 1898. — L. Crouslé, *la Vie et les œuvres de Voltaire*, 1899. — S. G. Tallentyre, *The Life of Voltaire*, 1903. — G. Lanson, *Voltaire*, 1906. — S. G. Tallentyre, *The Friends of Voltaire*, 1906. — *Œuvres de Voltaire*, ed. Beuchot, 70 vols., 1828 ff.; ed. Moland, 50 vols., 1877–1882, index by Pierron, 2 vols., 1885.

CHAPTER IX

E. Asse, *J.-J. Rousseau* (Bibliothèque des bibliographies critiques), 1901. — *Annales Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, 1905 ff. — J. Morley, *Rousseau*, 1873. — Mahrenholtz, *Rousseau*, 1889. — H. Beaudoin, *la Vie et les œuvres de Rousseau*, 1891. — A. Chuquet, *Rousseau*, 1893. — H. Höffding, *Rousseau und seine Philosophie*, 1897. — Nourrisson, *Rousseau et le Rousseauisme*, 1903. — Frederika Macdonald, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau, a new Criticism*, 1906. — J. Lemaître, *Rousseau*, 1907. — E. Faguet, *Vie de Rousseau*, 1911. — J. R. Lowell, *Among my Books*. — E. Ritter, *la Famille et la jeunesse de*

Rousseau, 1896. — L. Ducros, *J.-J. Rousseau, de Genève à l'Ermitage*, 1908. — E. Champion, *J.-J. Rousseau et la Révolution française*, 1910. — Brunetière, *la Folie de Rousseau*, in *Etudes critiques*, Vol. IV. — F. Mugnier, *Mme de Warens et Rousseau*, 1891. — Perey et Maugras, *Madame d'Epinay*, 1881–1883. — H. Buffenoir, *la Comtesse d'Houdetot, sa famille, ses amis*, 1905. — J. Texte, *Rousseau et les origines du cosmopolitisme littéraire*, 1895. — Mornet, *le Sentiment de la nature en France de Rousseau à Bernardin de Saint-Pierre*, 1907. — A. Schinz, *Rousseau, a Forerunner of Pragmatism*, 1909. — Bernubi, *Tolstoi continuateur de Rousseau*, in *Annales J.-J. Rousseau*, 1907.

CHAPTER X

Rosenkranz, *Diderots Leben und Werke*, 1866. — Avezac-Lavigne, *Diderot et la société du baron d'Holbach*, 1875. — Scherer, *Diderot*, 1880. — J. Morley, *Diderot and the Encyclopedists*, 1891. — J. Reinach, *Diderot*, 1894. — L. Ducros, *Diderot*, 1894. — A. Collignon, *Diderot*, 1895. — Caro, *la Fin du dix-huitième siècle*, 1880. — C. S. Baldwin, *Diderot and Sterne*, in *Pub. of Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America*, 1902. — Rocafort, *les Doctrines littéraires de l'Encyclopédie*, 1890. — Brunetière, *les Origines de l'esprit encyclopédique*, in *Etudes sur le XVIIIe siècle*, 1911. — P. Duprat, *les Encyclopédistes*, 1865. — L. Ducros, *les Encyclopédistes*, 1900.

CHAPTER XI

Lanfrey, *l'Eglise et les philosophes*, 1857. — Th. Funck-Brentano, *les Sophistes français et la révolution européenne*, 1905. — J. Fabre, *De Bayle à Condorcet*, 1910. — Baguenault de Puchesse, *Condillac*, 1910. — A. Keim, *Helvétius*, 1907. — Damiron, *Etude sur la philosophie de d'Holbach*, 1851. — Lebourgo, *Un homme de lettres au XVIIIe siècle, Duclos*, 1902. — J. Bertrand, *D'Alembert*, 1889. — Lenel, *Marmontel*, 1902. — Scherer, *Melchior Grimm*, 1887. — A. Mazure, *les Idées de l'abbé Morellet*, 1910. — G. Weulersse, *le Mouvement physiocratique en France de 1756 à 1770*, 1910. — G. Schelle, *le Docteur Quesnay*, 1907. — G. Schelle, *Vincent de Gournay*, 1897. — G. Schelle, *Dupont de Nemours et l'école physiocrate*, 1888. — Paul Janet, *Histoire de la science politique dans ses rapports avec la morale*, 1887. — J. Morley, *Turgot*, in *Critical Miscellanies*. — Léon Say, *Turgot*, 1887. — G. Schelle, *Turgot*, 1909. — J. Morley, *Condorcet*, in *Critical Miscellanies*. — Robinet, *Condorcet*, 1893. — Alengry, *Condorcet*, 1903. — V. Advielle, *Babeuf et le Babouvisme*, 1884.

CHAPTER XII

J. Haas, *Anfänge der Naturschilderung im französischen Roman: Rousseau, Saint-Pierre, Chateaubriand*, in *Zeitsch. für franz. Sp. und Lit.*, 1903. — Merlant, *le Roman personnel de Rousseau à Fromentin*, 1905. — Lanessan,

Œuvres de Buffon (the Introduction), 1883. — Flourens, *Buffon, histoire de ses travaux et de ses idées*, 1850. — Lebasteur, *Buffon*, 1888. — A. Barine, *Bernardin de Saint-Pierre*, 1891. — F. Maury, *Etude sur la vie et les œuvres de Bernardin de Saint-Pierre*, 1892.

CHAPTER XIII

Faguet, *la Poésie française depuis 1700*, reports of lectures, in *Revue des Cours et Conférences*, 1898–1899 and foll. — P. Dupont, *Houdar de la Motte*, 1898. — *Petits poètes du XVIIIe siècle* (Bernis, Bertin, Bonnard, Boufflers, Desforges Maillard, Gentil Bernard, Gilbert, Gresset, Lattaignant, Malfilâtre, Piron, Vadé), 12 vols., 1879–1886. — J. Weiss, *Nicolas Gilberts Satiren*, 1896. — Laffay, *le Poète Gilbert*, 1898. — Desnoiresterres, *le Chevalier Dorat et les poètes légers au XVIIIe siècle*, 1887.

CHAPTER XIV

Sainte-Beuve, on Delille, in *Portraits littéraires*, Vol. II. — H. Potez, *l'Elégie en France avant le romantisme*, 1898. — Baldensperger, *Gessner en France*, in *Revue hist. litt. de la France*, 1903. — Bertha Reed, *Influence of Gessner on English Literature*, Philadelphia, 1905. — Baldensperger, *Young et ses 'Nuits' en France*, in *Etudes d'histoire littéraire*, 1907. — R. Rosières, *la Littérature anglaise en France de 1750 à 1800*, in *Recherches sur la poésie contemporaine*, 1896. — R. Rosières, *la Littérature allemande en France de 1750 à 1800*, in *Recherches sur la poésie contemporaine*, 1896. — L. Claretie, *Florian*, 1888. — G. Renard, *l'Influence de l'antiquité classique au XVIIIe siècle et au commencement du XIXe*, Lausanne, 1875. — L Bertrand, *la Fin du classicisme et le retour à l'antique*, 1898. — S. Rocheblave, *Essai sur le comte de Caylus*, 1887. — Faguet, *André Chénier*, 1902. — Haraszti, *la Poésie d'André Chénier*, 1892. — Sainte-Beuve, *Ecouchard-Lebrun* in *Causeries du lundi*, Vol. V.

CHAPTER XV

H. Cordier, *Bibliographie de Beaumarchais*, 1883. — L. de Loménie, *Beaumarchais et son temps*, 1856. — Lintilhac, *Beaumarchais et ses œuvres*, 1887. — A. Hallays, *Beaumarchais*, 1897.

CHAPTER XVI

Caro, *la Fin du XVIIIe siècle*, 1880. — Ferraz, *Histoire de la philosophie pendant la Révolution*, 1889. — A. Lichtenberger, *le Socialisme et la révolution française*, 1899. — D'Haussonville, *le Salon de Madame Necker*, 1882. — Guillois, *le Salon de Madame Helvétius*, 1894. — Guillois, *la Marquise de Condorcet*, 1896. — Ph. Godet, *Madame de Charrière et ses amis*, 1906. — Aulard, *les Orateurs de l'Assemblée Constituante*, 1882. — Aulard, *les Orateurs*

de la Révolution, (Législative, Convention), 1885. — A. Chabrier, *les Orateurs politiques de la France*, 1888. — Bord, *la Franc-Maçonnerie en France des origines à 1815*, 1909. — L. and C. de Loménie, *les Mirabeau*, 5 vols., 1878–1891. — E. Rousse, *Mirabeau*, 1891. — Hatin, *Histoire de la presse française*, 1859–1861; *Bibliographie historique et critique de la presse française*, 1866. — P. d'Estrées, *le Père Duchesne*, 1908. — Pellisson, *Chamfort*, 1895. — Lescure, *Rivarol*, 1883. — Lebreton, *Rivarol*, 1896. — Welschinger, *le Théâtre de la Révolution*, 1881. — A. Liéby, *le Théâtre de Marie-Joseph Chénier*, 1901. — Ch. Cestre, *la Révolution française et les poètes anglais*, 1906.

PART V

CHAPTER I

V. Giraud, *Principaux courants de la littérature française au XIXe siècle*, in *Revue des Cours et Conférences*, March, 1900. — M. Albert, *la Littérature française sous la Révolution, l'Empire et la Restauration*, 1891. — G. Merlet, *Tableau de la littérature française de 1800 à 1815*, 1878. — Jullien, *Histoire de la poésie à l'époque impériale*, 1844. — F. Picavet, *les Idéologues*, 1891. — E. Caro, *Du mysticisme au XVIIIe siècle* (Saint-Martin), 1852. — J. Galley, *Claude Fauriel*, 1909. — Cogordan, *Joseph de Maistre*, 1894. — J. Morley, on Joseph de Maistre, in *Critical Miscellanies*, 1871. — Lescure, *Joseph de Maistre et sa famille*, 1892. — F. Descostes, *Joseph de Maistre avant la Révolution*, 1893. — Paulhan, *Joseph de Maistre et sa philosophie*, 1893. — M. des Granges, *Geoffroy et la littérature dramatique sous le Consulat et l'Empire*, 1897. — M. Arnold, on Joubert, in *Essays in Criticism*, first series. — Pailhès, *Du nouveau sur Joubert*, 1900. — M. Souriau, *Népomucène Lemercier et ses correspondants*, 1908. — C. Bellier-Dumaine, *Alexandre Duval et son œuvre dramatique*, 1905. — Baldensperger, *le Genre troubadour*, in *Etudes d'histoire littéraire*, 1907. — Th. Gerold, *Zum 'genre troubadour' um 1780*, in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, Vol. CXXVI.

CHAPTER II

Lady Blennerhassett, *Frau von Staël*, 1887–1889. (There are French and English translations.) — A. Sorel, *Madame de Staël*, 1890. — E. Ritter, *Notes sur Madame de Staël*, 1899. — C. Dejob, *Madame de Staël et l'Italie*, 1890. — P. Gautier, *Madame de Staël et Napoléon*, 1903. E. Ollion, *les Idées philosophiques, morales et politiques de Mme de Staël*, 1910. — G. Rudler, *Bibliographie critique des œuvres de Benjamin Constant*, 1909. — G. Rudler, *la Jeunesse de Benjamin Constant*, 1909. — De Lauris, *Benjamin Constant et les idées libérales*, 1904.

CHAPTER III

Lescure, *Chateaubriand*, 1892. — Pailhès, *Chateaubriand, sa femme et ses amis*, 1896. — V. Giraud, *Chateaubriand*, 1904. — Giraud, *Chateaubriand. études littéraires*, 1907. — Sainte-Beuve, *Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire*, 1860. — Brunetière, *le Mal du siècle*, in *Histoire et littérature*, 1884–1886. — Brunetière, *l'Evolution des genres*, Chap. VI. — J. Bédier, Articles on Chateaubriand in America in *Revue d'histoire littéraire*, 1899, 1900, 1901, or in *Etudes critiques*, 1903. — E. Dick, *Quelques sources ignorées du Voyage en Amérique de Chateaubriand*, in *Revue d'hist. litt.*, 1906. — E. Dick, *Plagiats de Chateaubriand*, Berne diss., 1907. — Article by P. Martino in *Revue d'hist. litt.*, with bibliography, 1909. — A. France, *Lucile de Chateaubriand*, 1894. — A. Bardoux, *Madame de Beaumont*, 1884. — A. Bardoux, *Madame de Custine*, 1888. — A. Bardoux, *Madame de Duras*, 1898. — A. Le Braz, *Au pays d'exil de Chateaubriand*, 1908. — E. Biré, *Les dernières années de Chateaubriand*, 1902. — *Memoirs d'Outre-tombe*, ed. Biré, 1898. — Levallois, *Un précurseur, Senancour*, 1897. — J. Merlant, *Senancour*, 1907. — G. Michaut, *Senancour*, 1910.

CHAPTER IV

Nettement, *Histoire de la littérature française sous la Restauration*, 1858. — Nettement, *Histoire de la littérature française sous le gouvernement de juillet*, 1859. — Jeanroy-Félix, *Histoire de la littérature pendant la Restauration*, 1888. — Jeanroy-Félix, *Histoire de la littérature pendant la monarchie de juillet*, 1888. — T. R. Davies, *French Romanticism and the Press*, Cambridge, England, 1906. — Desgranges, *la Presse littéraire sous la Restauration*, 1907. — Faguet, *Politiques et moralistes du XIXe siècle*, 1891–1899. — A. Carrel, *Essai sur la vie et les œuvres de P.-L. Courier*, in the *Œuvres* of Courier, 1834. — J. Reinach, *les Conciones français*, 1893. — Spuller, *Royer-Collard*, 1895. — J. Simon, *Thiers, Guizot, Rémusat*, 1875. — A. Bardoux, *Guizot*, 1894. — P. de Rémusat, *A. Thiers*, 1889. — E. Zévort, *Thiers*, 1892. — C. Huit, *la Vie et les œuvres de Ballanche*, 1903. — Spuller, *Lamennais*, 1892. — Mercier, *Lamennais*, 1893. — A. Roussel, *Lamennais*, 1893. — Boutard, *Lamennais, sa vie et ses doctrines*, 1905–1908. — P. Janet, *la Philosophie de Lamennais*, 1890. — Ricard, *l'Ecole menaisienne*, 1883–1884. — Montalembert, *Lacordaire*, 1862. — D'Haussonville, *Lacordaire*, 1895. — Vicomte de Meaux, *Montalembert*, 1897. — Lecanuet, *Montalembert*, 1895–1907. — K. O'Meara, *F. Ozanam*, New York, 1867. — A. Ozanam, *Vie de F. Ozanam*, 1879. — B. Faulquier, *F. Ozanam*, 1903.

CHAPTER V

H. Taine, *Philosophes français au XIXe siècle*, 1857. — Ravaisson, *Rapport sur les progrès de la philosophie en France au XIXe siècle*, 1868. — M. Ferraz, *Etude sur la philosophie en France au XIXe siècle*, 1877. —

M. Couailhac, *Maine de Biran*, 1905. — G. Michelet, *Maine de Biran*, 1906. — Paul Janet, *Victor Cousin et son œuvre*, 1885. — J. Simon, *Victor Cousin*, 1887. — Barthélemy Sainte-Hilaire, *Victor Cousin*, 1895. — Lévy-Bruhl, *la Philosophie de Victor Cousin*, 1900. — Ollé-Laprune, *Théodore Jouffroy*, 1899. — T. Kirkup, *History of Socialism*, fourth edition, London, 1909. — Sudre, *Histoire du communisme*, 1856. — E. Fournière, *les Théories socialistes au XIXe siècle. De Babeuf à Proudhon*, 1904. — J. Gros, *le Mouvement littéraire socialiste depuis 1830*, 1904. — A. J. Booth, *Saint-Simon and Saint-Simonism*, London, 1871. — Paul Janet, *Saint-Simon et le saint-simonisme*, 1878. — Charléty, *Histoire du saint-simonisme*, 1896. — G. Weill, *l'Ecole saint-simonienne, son histoire, son influence jusqu' à nos jours*, 1896. — Lévy-Bruhl, *la Philosophie d'Auguste Comte*, 1900. — H. Bourgin, *Fourier, contribution à l'étude du socialisme français*, 1905. — H. Bourgin, *Victor Considérant, son œuvre*, 1909. — J. Prudhommeaux, *Icarie et son fondateur, Etienne Cabet*, 1907. — P.-Félix Thomas, *Pierre Leroux*, 1904. — On P. Leroux, see also *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, May 15, 1906. — M. Golliet, *Louis Blanc, sa doctrine, son action*, 1903. — A. Desjardins, *P.-J. Proudhon*, 1896. — Droz, *P.-J. Proudhon*, 1909.

CHAPTER VI

Cyprien Desmarais, *Essai sur les classiques et les romantiques*, 1824. — G. Michaut, *Pages de critique*, 1910. — G. Renard, *la Littérature et les arts*, chapter in *la Méthode scientifique de l'histoire littéraire*, 1900. — Asselineau, *Bibliographie romantique*, 1873. — Th. Gautier, *Histoire du romantisme*, 1874. — P. Lasserre, *le Romantisme français*, 1908. — E. Seillière, *le Mal romantique*, 1908. — C. Lecigne, *le Fléau romantique*, 1910. — L. Maigron, *le Romantisme et les mœurs*, 1910. — J. Texte, *Etudes de littérature européenne*, (The Lake School in France, and the German Influence), 1898. — Estève, *Byron et le romantisme français*, 1907. — L. Séché, *le Cénacle de la Muse française*, 1908. — M. Salomon, *Charles Nodier et le groupe romantique*, 1908. — A. Jullien, *le Romantisme et l'éditeur Renduel*, 1897. — A. Delvau, *Gérard de Nerval*, 1865. — Gauthier-Ferrières, *Gérard de Nerval*, 1906. — Sainte-Beuve, on Aloïsius Bertrand, in *Portraits littéraires*, Vol. II. — J. Chasle-Pavie, *Aloysius Bertrand*, in *Revue de Paris*, 1911. — J. Claretie, *Pétrus Borel, le lycanthrope*, 1865.

CHAPTER VII

E. Pelletan, *Lamartine*, 1869. — E. Ollivier, *Lamartine*, 1874. — C. de Pomairols, *Lamartine*, 1889. — E. Rod, *Lamartine*, 1893. — E. Deschanel, *Lamartine*, 1893. — E. Zyromski, *Lamartine, poète lyrique*, 1897. — M. Citoleux, *la Poésie philosophique au XIXe siècle: Lamartine*, 1905. — E. Sugier, *Lamartine*, 1910. — Quentin-Bauchart, *Lamartine homme politique*, 1903. — C. Alexandre, *Souvenirs sur Lamartine*, 1884. — F. Reyssié,

la Jeunesse de Lamartine, 1891. — Chamborand de Périssat, *Lamartine inconnu*, 1891. — L. Séché, *Lamartine de 1816 à 1830*, 1906. — A. France, *l'Elvire de Lamartine*, 1893. — R. Doumic, *Lettres d'Elvire à Lamartine*, 1906. — P. de Lacretelle, *les Origines et la jeunesse de Lamartine*, 1911. — M. Paléologue, *Alfred de Vigny*, 1891. — Dorison, *Alfred de Vigny, poète philosophe*, 1891. — L. Séché, *Alfred de Vigny et son temps*, 1902. — E. Dupuy, *la Jeunesse des romantiques* (Hugo and Vigny), 1905. — Lauvrière, *Alfred de Vigny*, 1909. — L. Séché, *Alfred de Vigny et son temps*, 1902. — Dorison, *Un symbole social, A. de Vigny et la poésie politique*, 1894. — A. Barine, *Alfred de Musset*, 1893. — L. Séché, *Alfred de Musset*, 1907. — P. Lindau, *Alfred de Musset*, 1877. — C. Maurras, *les Amants de Venise*, 1901. — M. Clouard, *Bibliographie des œuvres d'Alfred de Musset*, 1883. — E. Richet, *Théophile Gautier*, 1873. — M. Du Camp, *Théophile Gautier*, 1890. — Spoelberch de Lovenjoul, *Histoire des œuvres de Théophile Gautier*, 1887. — N. Peyrat, *Béranger et Lamennais*, 1861. — P. Boiteau, *Vie de Béranger*, 1861. — J. Janin, *Béranger et son temps*, 1866. — Causeret, *Béranger*, 1894. — A. Boulle, *Béranger*, 1908. — Brivois, *Bibliographie de l'œuvre de Béranger*, 1876. — J. Boulenger, *Marceline Desbordes-Valmore*, 1909. — Abbé Lecigne, *Briseux*, 1898. — E. Biré, *Laprade*, 1886.

CHAPTER VIII

A. C. Swinburne, *Essay on Victor Hugo*, London, 1886. — E. Dupuy, *Victor Hugo, l'homme et le poète*, 1887. — L. Mabilleau, *Victor Hugo*, 1893. — C. Renouvier, *Victor Hugo, le poète*, 1893. — F. Brunetière (editor), *Victor Hugo*, prepared by pupils of the Ecole normale, 1902. — Mme Hugo, *Victor Hugo raconté par un témoin de sa vie*, 1868. — E. Biré, *Victor Hugo et la Restauration; Victor Hugo avant 1830; Victor Hugo après 1830; Victor Hugo après 1852;* 1869–1893. — G. Simon, *l'Enfance de Victor Hugo*, 1904. — A. Guiard, *la Fonction du poète, étude sur Victor Hugo*, 1909. — Renouvier, *Victor Hugo, le philosophe*, 1900. — G. Duval, *Dictionnaire des métaphores de Victor Hugo*, 1888. — M. Souriau, edition of the *Préface de Cromwell*, 1897. — E. Rigal, *Victor Hugo, poète épique*, 1900.

CHAPTER IX

N. Brazier, *Chronique des petits théâtres de Paris*, 1837 (reprint by d'Heylli, 1883). — P. Ginisty, *le Mélodrame*, 1910. — M. Albert, *les Théâtres des boulevards*, 1902. — H. Beaulieu, *les Théâtres du boulevard du Crime*, 1905. — Th. Muret, *l'Histoire par le théâtre*, 1865. — C. Nodier, Introduction to the *Théâtre choisi* of Pixerécourt, 1841–1843. — Marsan, *le Mélodrame et G. de Pixerécourt*, in *Revue d'histoire litt. de la France*, Vol. VII. — A. Virely, *Pixerécourt*, 1909. — Le Roy, *l'Aube du théâtre romantique*, 1902. — P. Nebout, *le Drame romantique*, 1897. — C. Latreille, *la Fin du théâtre romantique et François Ponsard*, 1899. — H. Parigot, *le Drame d'Alexandre*

Dumas, 1898. — P. et V. Glachant, *Essai sur le théâtre de Victor Hugo*, 1902–1903. — E. Sakellaridès, *Alfred de Vigny auteur dramatique*, 1902. — Lafoscade, *le Théâtre d'Alfred de Musset*, 1901. — Lenient, *la Comédie au XIXe siècle*, 1898. — Desgranges, *la Comédie et les mœurs sous la restauration et la monarchie de juillet*, 1904.

CHAPTER X

J. Merlant, *le Roman passionnel de Rousseau à Fromentin*, 1905. — Gilbert, *le Roman en France au XIXe siècle*, 1896. — Charles-Brun, *le Roman social en France au XIXe siècle*, 1910. — A. A. Paton, *Henri Beyle*, London, 1874. — E. Rod, *Stendhal*, 1892. — H. Cordier, *Stendhal raconté par ses amis et amies*, 1893. — A. Chuquet, *Stendhal-Beyle*, 1902. — A. Filon, *Mérimée et ses amis*, 1894. — A. Filon, *Mérimée*, 1898. — M. Tourneux, *Prosper Mérimée, sa bibliographie*, 1876. — F. Chambon, *Notes sur Mérimée*, 1903. — L. Pinvert, *Sur Mérimée*, 1908. — E. Caro, *George Sand*, 1887. — W. Karénine, *George Sand*, 1899–1901. — R. Doumic, *George Sand*, 1909. — L. Buis, *les Théories sociales de George Sand*, 1910. — A. Le Roy, *George Sand et ses amis*, 1903. — P. Mariéton, *George Sand et Alfred de Musset*, 1897. — M.-A. Leblond, *George Sand socialiste*, in *Revue socialiste*, 1904. — M. Barrière, *l'Œuvre d'Honoré de Balzac*, 1890. — E. Biré, *Honoré de Balzac*, 1897. — Mary Sanders, *Life of Balzac*, London, 1904. — A. Le Breton, *Balzac*, 1905. — Brunetière, *Honoré de Balzac*, 1906. — F. Lawton, *Balzac*, London, 1910. — P. Flat, *Essais sur Balzac*, 1892; *Nouveaux essais*, 1895. — G. Ferry, *Balzac et ses amis*, 1888. — Spoelberch de Lovenjoul, *Histoire des œuvres de Balzac*, 1886. — Spoelberch de Lovenjoul, *Autour de Honoré de Balzac*, 1897. — Hanotaux et Vicaire, *la Jeunesse de Balzac*, 1903. — Cerfbeer et Christophe, *Répertoire de la Comédie humaine*, 1887. — A. Lefranc, *Maurice de Guérin*, 1910.

CHAPTER XI

Valentin, *Augustin Thierry*, 1895. — R. Heath, *Quinet, His early Life and Writings*, London, 1881. — C. Cestre, Introduction to edition of *France et Allemagne*, 1908. — Chassin, *Edgar Quinet*, 1859. — Corréard, *Michelet*, 1887. — G. Monod, *Jules Michelet*, 1905. — J. Simon, *Mignet, Michelet et Henri Martin*, 1889. — G. Lanson, *la Formation de la méthode historique de Michelet*, in *Revue d'histoire moderne*, 1905. — L. Cazamian, Introduction to edition of *l'Oiseau*, Oxford, 1907. — W. Robertson, Introduction to edition of *la Mer*, Oxford, 1907. — H. Avenel, *la Presse française depuis 1789 jusqu'à nos jours*, 1900.

CHAPTER XII

R. Fath, *Influence de la science sur la littérature dans la deuxième moitié du XIXe siècle*, 1901. — Levallois, *Sainte-Beuve*, 1872. — Haussonville, *Sainte-Beuve*, 1875. — G. Michaut, *Sainte-Beuve avant les lundis*, 1903. —

G. Michaut, *Etudes sur Sainte-Beuve*, 1905. — J. Bourdeau, *la Psychologie et la philosophie de Sainte-Beuve*, in *Compte rendu des séances de l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques*, 1905. — G. M. Harper, *Sainte-Beuve*. New York, 1909. — L. Séché, *Sainte-Beuve*, 1904. — G. Monod, *Renan, Taine, Michelet*, 1894. — A. de Margerie, *Taine*, 1894. — E. Boutmy, *H. Taine*, in *Annales de l'Ecole des sciences politiques*, 1897. — V. Giraud, *Essai sur Taine*, Fribourg, 1901. — Barzellotti, *Ippolito Taine* (French translation by Dietrich, 1901). — Aulard, *Taine historien de la Révolution française*, 1907. — P. Nève, *la Philosophie de Taine*, Louvain, 1908. — A. Laborde-Milaà, *Hippolyte Taine*, 1909. — M. Grant Duff, *Renan*, London, 1893. — R. Allier, *la Philosophie d'Ernest Renan*, 1895. — G. Séailles, *Ernest Renan*, 1895. — Mary Darmsteter, *Ernest Renan*, 1898. — I. Babbitt, Introduction to *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse*, Boston, 1902. — G. Sorel, *le Système historique de Renan*, 1906. — H. Parigot, *Renan*, 1909. — Strauss, *la Politique de Renan*, 1909.

CHAPTER XIII

G. Pellissier, *le Mouvement littéraire contemporain*, 1901. — David-Sauvageot, *le Réalisme et le naturalisme*, 1889. — E. Zola, *le Roman expérimental*. 1880. — E. Zola, *les Romanciers naturalistes*, 1881. — F. Brunetière, *le Roman naturaliste*, second edition, 1892. — G. Renard, *Etudes sur la France contemporaine* (*le Naturalisme*), 1888. — R. Doumic, *Ecrivains d'aujourd'hui*. 1894. — M. Du Camp, *Souvenirs littéraires*, 1882–1883. — J. C. Tarver, *Gustave Flaubert*, London, 1895. — E. Faguet, *Flaubert*, 1899. — Lévy-Bruhl, *Flaubert philosophe*, in *Revue de Paris*, 1900. — Dumesnil, *Flaubert, son hérédité, son milieu, sa méthode*, 1905. — R. Descharmes, *Flaubert, sa vie, son caractère et ses idées avant 1857*, 1909. — E. and J. de Goncourt, *Journal*, 9 vols., 1887–1896. — P. Alexis, *Emile Zola*, 1882. — Massis, *Comment Emile Zola composait ses romans*, 1906. — H. Martineau, *le Roman scientifique d'Emile Zola*, 1907. — E. Lepelletier, *Emile Zola*, 1908. — Lumbroso. *Souvenirs sur Maupassant*, Rome, 1905. — Maynial, *la Vie et l'œuvre de Maupassant*, 1907. — P. Mahn, *Guy de Maupassant, sein Leben und seine Werke*, 1909. — Deries, *Octave Feuillet*, 1901. — Gonse, *Fromentin*, 1880. — Grelé, *Barbey d'Aurevilly*, 1902. — E. Seillière, *Barbey d'Aurevilly*, 1910. — H. Chapoutot, *Villiers de l'Isle-Adam*, 1908. — E. de Rougemont, *Villiers de l'Isle-Adam*, 1910. — C. Lemire, *Jules Verne*, 1908.

CHAPTER XIV

B. Matthews, *French Dramatists*, New York, 1881. — R. Doumic, *Portraits d'écrivains*, 1892. — H. Parigot, *le Théâtre d'hier*, 1893. — A. Filon, *De Dumas à Rostand*, 1898. — H. Parigot, *Emile Augier*, 1894. — P. Morillot, *Emile Augier*, 1901. — H. Gaillard de Champris, *Emile Augier et la comédie*

sociale, 1910. — Séché et Bertaut, *l'Evolution du théâtre contemporain*, 1908. — Thalasso, *le Théâtre-Libre*, 1909. — J. Ernest-Charles, *le Théâtre des poètes*, 1910. — See especially the General Bibliography.

CHAPTER XV

Th. Gautier, *Rapport sur le progrès de la poésie depuis 1830*, 1868.— C. Mendès, *le Mouvement poétique français de 1867 à 1900*, 1903. — J. Huret, *Enquête sur l'évolution littéraire*, 1891. — G. Pellissier, *le Mouvement littéraire contemporain*, 1901. — Canat, *Du sentiment de la solitude morale chez les romantiques et les premiers Parnassiens*, 1904. — Cassagne, *la Théorie de l'art pour l'art en France*, 1906. — E. Vigié-Lecocq, *la Poésie contemporaine (1884–1896)*, 1896. — Van Bever et Léautaud, *Poètes d'aujourd'hui*, 1900. — A. Beaunier, *la Poésie nouvelle*, 1902. — G. Walch, *Anthologie des poètes français contemporains*, 1906. — La Ville de Miremont, *le Poète Bouilhet*, 1888. — E. Frère, *Louis Bouilhet*, 1908. — Th. Gautier, Introduction to Baudelaire's poems, 1868. — Asselineau, *Baudelaire*, 1869. — C. Crépet *Charles Baudelaire*, étude revue par Jacques Crépet, 1908. — A. Patterson, *l'Influence de Poe sur Baudelaire*, Grenoble, 1903. — Calmettes, *Leconte de Lisle*, 1892. — M.-A. Leblond, *Leconte de Lisle*, 1906. — J. Dornis, *Leconte de Lisle*, 1909. — J. Vianey, *les Sources de Leconte de Lisle*, 1907. — C. Mendès, *la Légende du Parnasse contemporain*, 1884. — Ph. Berthelot, *Louis Ménard et son œuvre*, 1902. — M. Barrès, on Louis Ménard, in *le Voyage de Sparte*, 1906. — R. Canat, *la Renaissance de la Grèce antique (1820–1850)*, 1911. — Zyromski, *Sully Prudhomme*, 1907. — M. Citoleux, *Madame Ackermann*, 1906. — M. Guyau, *l'Art au point de vue sociologique*, 1890. — M. Nordau, *Dégénérescence* (French translation), 1894. — C. Morice, *la Littérature de tout à l'heure*, 1889. — Tellier, *Nos poètes*, 1889. — Byvanck, *Un Hollandais à Paris en 1891*, 1892. — A. Symons, *The Symbolist Movement in Literature*, London, 1899. — Kahn, *Symbolistes et décadents*, 1902. — Retté, *le Symbolisme*, 1903. — A. Schinz, *Literary Symbolism in France*, in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 1903. — E. Lepelletier, *Paul Verlaine*, 1907. — P. Berrichon, *Vie de Rimbaud*, 1897. — L. Bocquet, *A. Samain, sa vie et son œuvre*, 1905. — Valbel, *Chansonniers et cabarets artistiques*, 1895. — L. de Bercy, *Montmartre et ses chansons*, 1902. — B. Millanvoye, *Anthologie des poètes de Montmartre*, 1909.

CHAPTER XVI

Janssens, *le Néo-criticisme de Charles Renouvier*, Louvain, 1904. — Ph. Bridel, *Ch. Renouvier et sa philosophie*, Lausanne, 1905. — A. Fouillée, *la Morale, l'art et la religion d'après M. Guyau*, 1889. — Aslan, *la Morale selon Guyau*, 1906. — H. Leyret, *Waldeck-Rousseau et la troisième République*, 1908. — E. Lovinesco, *J.-J. Weiss*, 1909. — G. Stirbey, *J.-J. Weiss*, 1911. — A. Meyer, *Ce que mes yeux ont vu*, 1911.

PART VI

CHAPTERS I AND II

Qui êtes-vous? Annuaire des contemporains, 1910. — J.-H. Retinger, *Histoire de la littérature française du romantisme à nos jours*, 1911. — Casella et Gaubert, *la Nouvelle Littérature (1895–1905)*, 1906. — E. Gilbert, *Dix années de roman français*, in *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, 1908. — Abbé Béthléem, *Romans à lire et romans à proscrire* (amusing clerical judgments), 1906. — Abbé Béthléem, *les Pièces de théâtre* (amusing clerical judgments), 1910. — G. Walch, *Nouvelles pages anthologiques*, 1910. — H. Höffding, *Philosophes contemporains* (French translation), 1906. — V. Giraud, *les Maîtres de l'heure*, 1911. — L. Maury, *Figures littéraires*, 1911. — P. de Coubertin, *l'Evolution française sous la troisième République*, 1896. — J. E. C. Bodley, *France*, London, 1898. — G. Hanotaux, *Histoire de la France contemporaine*, 1903–1909. — J. C. Bracq, *France under the Republic*, New York, 1910. — J. Reinach, *Histoire de l'Affaire Dreyfus*, 1901–1911. — B. Frankfort, *Guide dans le maquis de l'Affaire Dreyfus*, 1904. — R.-L.-M. *Histoire sommaire de l'Affaire Dreyfus*, 1904. — H. Dutrait-Crozon, *Précis de l'Affaire Dreyfus*, 1909. — G. Pellissier, *l'Affaire Dreyfus et la littérature française*, in *Etudes de littérature et de morale contemporaines*, 1905. — W. L. George, *France in the Twentieth Century*, London, 1908. — Articles by MM. Lalande and Le Roy in *Philosophical Review*, 1905 and foll. — W. James, *Pragmatism*, New York, 1907. — M. Hébert, *le Pragmatisme*, 1908. — A. Chide, *Pragmatisme et intellectualisme*, in *Revue philosophique*, 1908. — G. Cantecor, *la Philosophie nouvelle et la vie de l'esprit*, in *Revue philosophique*, 1903. — See bibliography of Bergson literature in F. L. Pogson's translation, *Time and Free Will*, London, 1910. — G. Rageot, Review of *l'Evolution créatrice*, in *Revue philosophique*, 1907. — W. James, *The Philosophy of Bergson*, in *Hibbert Journal*, 1909. — H. Weldon Carr, *The Philosophy of Henri Bergson*, in *Hibbert Journal*, 1910. — R. Gillouin, *la Philosophie de M. Henri Bergson*, in *Revue de Paris*, 1911. — C. Bouglé, *Syndicalistes et Bergsoniens*, in *Revue du mois*, 1907. — S. Reinach, *Orpheus, histoire générale des religions*, 1909. — M. de Wulf, *Introduction à la philosophie néo-scolastique*, 1904. — J. L. Perrier, *The Revival of Scholastic Philosophy in the Nineteenth Century*, New York, 1909. — A. Houtin, *l'Américanisme*, 1904. — P. Sabatier, *la Séparation des églises et de l'état*, 1906. — J. E. C. Bodley, *The Church in France*, London, 1906. — Faguet, *l'Anticléricalisme*, 1906. — A. Loisy, *Simples réflexions sur le décret du Saint-Office*, 1908. — A. Loisy, *l'Evangile et l'Eglise*, 1908. — "Catholici," *Lendemains d'encyclique*, 1908. — C. Guignebert, *Modernisme et tradition catholique en France*, 1908. — P. Sabatier, *les Modernistes*, 1909. — G. Gentile, *Il Modernismo e i rapporti tra religione e filosofia*, 1909. — A. Fewkes, *Modernism*, in *Hibbert Journal*, 1909. — E. Dimnet, *The Crisis in the Growth of French Royalism*, in *The Nineteenth Century*, 1911.

— L. Liard, *l'Université de Paris*, 1909. — G. Lanson, *la Méthode de l'histoire littéraire*, in *Revue du mois*, 1910. — P. Leguay, *la Sorbonne*, 1910. — "Agathon" (H. Massis and A. de Tarde), *l'Esprit de la nouvelle Sorbonne*, 1911. — A. Poizat, *Classicisme et catholicisme*, 1911. — P. Descoqs, *A travers l'œuvre de M. Maurras*, 1911. — L. Laberthonnière, *Positivisme et catholicisme*, 1911.

INDEX OF NAMES

INDEX OF NAMES

Compiled by W. R. Spofford. Italic figures indicate the chief references.

A

Abélard, 13, 47, 49, 72, *90*, 97, 102, 527
Ablancourt, Perrot d', 420
Ablon, Mme d', 463
About, Edmond, 773, 822
Acarie, Mme, 346
Accursius, 245
Ackermann, Mme, 798
Adam de la Halle, 44, 46, *73–75*
Adam de Saint-Victor, 47
Adam, Mme, 823
Adam, Paul, 800, 801, 845
Addison, 430, 449, 470, 492
Ademarus Cabannensis, 53
Aélis de Blois, 44
Aélis, wife of Louis VII, 44
Æschylus, 472, 577, 687, 697, 794
Æsop, 687
Agricol Perdiguier, 717
Agrippina, 356
Aicard, Jean, 796, 846
Ailly, 95, 136
Aimard, Gustave, 708
Aïssé, Mlle, 464, 493
Ajalbert, Jean, 801
Alacoque, Marie, 401, 447
Alain de Lille, 101, *103*, 109
Alamanni, Luigi, 134, 191, 210, 258
Albéric de Briançon, 39
Albertino Mussato, 209
Albertus Magnus, 91, 92, 96, 99
Alciati, 245
Alcuin, 11, 12, 87, 96
Aleandro, Girolamo, 137, 141
Alembert, d', 447, 462, 463, 513, 519, 526, 542, 543, 544, 545, *550*
Alexandre de Bernay, 39
Alexander the Great, 36, 37, 39, 299
Alexander of Hales, 92
Alexander of Russia, 606
Alexandre de Ville-Dieu, 95, 100
Alexis, 57
Alexis, Paul, 767
Alfieri, 210, 450, 472
Algarotti, 444, 514
Allais, Alphonse, 846
Allais, Gustave, 264
Allan-Despréaux, Mme, 706
Amaury de Bène, 89
Amboise, François d', 217
Ambrosius de Milliis, 122
Amiel, 625, 814, 841
Amyot, Jacques, 136, 204, *207–208*, 235, 271, 285, 631
Anacreon, 191, 192, 687
Ancey, Georges, 846
André le Chapelain, 32, 44
Andrea del Sarto, 134
Andreini, Isabella, 292
Andrelini, Fausto, 136
Andrieux, 608
Andronicus Callistus, 137
Aneau, Barthélemy, 178
Angélique, Mère 332
Angellier, Auguste, 846
Angelo di Costanzo, 198
Angennes, Julie d', 278, 279, 313
Angoulême, duc d', 261
Anicet-Bourgeois, 695, 710
Anne of Austria, 306, 316, 389, 398, 417, 426
Anne de Bretagne, 132
Anselm, St., 13, 88, 325
Anselm of Laon, 90
Antier, Benjamin, 695, 696
Antoine, André, *786–787*, 843
Aphthonius, 349
Apollonius Rhodius, 196
Appian, 215
Arc, Jeanne d', 507, 729, 837, 860
Ardenne de Tizac, H., 879
Arène, Emmanuel, 853
Arène, Paul, 799
Aretino, 258
Argenson, marquis d', 461, 462, 513
Ariosto, 17, 196, 197, 215, 217, 219, 226, 258, 687
Aristophanes, 216, 227, 367
Aristotle, 40, 91. 95, 96, 100, 101, 109, 115, 119, 135, 157, 201, 202, 204, 207, 211, 212,

246, 251, 271, 297, 309, 323, 374, 396, 421, 429, 430, 435, 499
Arlincourt, vicomte d', 709
Arnauld, Antoine, 329, 333, 334, 335, 338, 347, 349, 419, 602
Arnauld d' Andilly, 411
Arnault, 608
Arnold, Matthew, 5, 389, 472, 606, 625
Arouet, Armand, 505
Arvers, Félix, 681
Assoucy, d', 268, 291
"Astronomer," The, 52
Aubignac, abbé d', 213, 215, *896–897*, 309, 317, 354, 419, 450, 468
Aubigné, Agrippa d', 224, *227–230*, 242, 251, 298, 416
Aude, 597
Audebrand, Philibert, 739
Audefroi le Gastard, 46
Audinot, 488, 692
Auger, 658
Augier, 373, 707, 778, *779–781*, 782, 784, 785, 842, 854
Augustine, Saint, 333, 342, 567
Augustus, 271
Aulard, 816
Aulnoy, Mme d', 410, 418
Autels, Guillaume des, 177, 178
Autran, Joseph, 799
Autreau, Jacques, 480
Avenel, H., 735
Avianus, 62
Aydie, d', 464

B

Babeuf, 555, 717
Bacciochi, Mme, 587
Bachaumont, 366, 465
Bacon, 239, 541
Bade, Josse, 205
Baïf, Jean-Antoine de, 175, 177, 178, *180*, 184, 193, 194, 196, 217, 436
Baïf, Lazare de, 174, 175, 178, 211
Balbi, Girolamo, 136
Baldwin of Flanders, 57
Ballanche, *655*, 718
Baluze, Etienne, 420
Balzac, Guez de, 253, 264, *270–274*, 278, 282, 288, 313, 342, 344, 376, 385, 392, 412
Balzac, Honoré de, 491, 656, 659, 707, 708, 713, 716, *720–723*, 736, 744, 759, 767, 772, 821, 857
Bandello, 172
Banville, Théodore de, 788, 790, *791–792*, 795, 796, 797, 799, 877, 879
Baour-Lormian, 608
Barante, 632
Barbès, 718
Barbey d'Aurevilly, 664, 754, *774–776*, 777, 809
Barbier, Auguste, 681
Barbieri, Niccolò, 292, 363
Barckhausen, 497
Barclay, 405
Bargone, Frédéric, 858
Barnave, 590
Baro, Balthazar, 284, 294, 314
Baron, 477, 491
Baronius, Cardinal, 319
Barrès, Maurice, *846–847*
Barrière, Théodore, 788
Barry, Mme du, 582
Bartas, Du, 224, *225–227*, 252, 873
Barthélemy, abbé, 574
Barthélemy de Loches, 211
Bartholus, 245
Bartram, William, 617
Basedow, 531
Basselin, Olivier, 485
Bassompierre, 423
Bataille, Frédéric, 847
Bataille, Henri, 843, 847, 848
Batiffol, Mgr, 835
Batilliat, Marcel, 801
Batteux, 445
Baudelaire, 661, 778, 790, 791, *792*, 795, 796, 799, 800, 804, 807, 809, 875
Bayle, 220, 328, 423, 443, 445, 446, *451–456*, 458, 460, 511, 541
Bayly, T. H., 43, 608
Bazard, 644, 645
Bazin, René, 841, *847–848*
Beau Brummell, 775
Beauclair, Henri, 799
Beauharnais, Mme de, 587
Beaumarchais, 367, 369, 485, *681–686*, 596, 687, 691, 697, 795
Beaumont, Gustave de, 733
Beaumont, Mme de, 587, 605, 621, 624
Beaunier, André, 848
Beauvoir, Roger de, 711
Beccaria, 548
Becker, Ph. Aug., 14, 22
Becq de Fouquières, 576
Becque, Henry, *785–786*
Béda, Noël, 221
Bédier, Joseph, 16, 31
Béjart, 362
Béjart, Armande, 367
Bellay, Cardinal du, 140, 165, 179
Bellay, Guillaume du, 165, 179, 243
Bellay, Joachim du, 148, 174, 175, 176, 177,

178, *179–180*, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 187, 188, 190, 191, 193, 194, 195, 197, 204, 224, 257, 577, 614, 653
Bellay, Martin du, 179, 243
Bellay, René du, 179
Belleau, 177, 178, 181, 192, 194, 196, 214, 217
Belleforest, François de, 172
Belle-Isle, maréchal de, 502
Bellerose, 293
Belloy, de, 474
Belot, Adolphe, 788
Beltrame, 292
Beltrami, 617
Bembo, 131, 142
Benedict, St., 13
Benoît de Sainte-More, 38, 40, 56
Benozzi, Giannetta, 480
Benserade, 282, 361, 430, 439
Bentham, 548, 760
Bentivoglio, 258
Béranger, 608, *679–681*, 796
Bérat, Frédéric, 45
Berchoux, 588
Berengarius, 88
Bérenger, Henri, 823
Bergasse, 582
Bergerat, Emile, 848
Bergson, Henri, *830–838*, 835
Berkeley, 330
Bernard, St., 13, 47, 49, 89, 90, 105, 259
Bernard de Chartres, 89
Bernard of Cluny, 47
Bernard, Catherine, 410
Bernard, Charles de, 759
Bernard, Claude, 757, 765, 810, 851
Bernard, Tristan (Paul) 848
Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, 521, *559–563*, 601, 620, 622, 650, 651, 666, 731, 869
Bernart de Ventadour, 44
Bernhardt, Sarah, 784, 788
Berni, 197, 258
Bernier, 329
Bernis, Cardinal de, 464
Bernstein, 843, 844, 848
Béroalde de Verville, 173
Beroaldo, Filippo, 136
Bérol, 28, 30
Berquin (sixteenth century), 221
Berquin, Arnaud, 563, 573
Berri, duchesse de, 398
Berryer, 635
Bersot, Ernest, 821
Bersuire, Pierre, 37, 115, 116
Bert, Paul, 814
Bertaut, 698
Bertaut, Jean, 177, *256–257*, 259, 417
Berthelot, 740
Bertheroy, Mme Jean. See Le Barillier, Mme Berthe-Corinne
Bertin, 572, 578, 650, 666
Bertin, Ed., 821
Bertran de Born, 44
Bertrand, Aloïsius (Louis), 655
Bertrand, Louis, 849
Bertrin, abbé, 621
Bérulle, Pierre de, Cardinal, 349, 392
Bessarion, Cardinal, 156
Bexon, abbé, 557
Beyle, Henri. See Stendhal.
Bèze, Théodore de, 174, 224, 346
Biard, Mme, 690
Binet, Claude, 177, 178
Bisson, Alexandre, 849
Bizet, 785
Blanc, Louis, 628, 648, 718, 733
Blanche de Castille, 46
Blanchecotte, Mme, 790
Blémont, Emile, 849
Blondel, 488
Blondel, Maurice, 835
Blondel de Nesle, 46
Blount, Mrs., 282
Bocage, 698
Boccaccio, 38, 70, 112, 133, 147, 159, 366, 435
Bodel, Jean, 14, 20, 46, 73
Bodin, 246–247, 747
Böhme, Jacob, 603
Böhmer, H., 339
Boethius, 12, 95, 100, 109, 553
Boétie, Etienne de la, 200, 231, 246
Boëx, Joseph-Henry. See Rosny, J.-H.
Boëx, Justin. See Rosny, J.-H.
Boiardo, 17
Boileau, 253, 255, 256, 257, 258, 260, 262, 265, 267, 268, 275, 284, 285, 288, 289, 290, 291, 311, 316, 321, 322, 327, 331, 334, 351, 358, 360, *376–387*, 397, 417, 419, 420, 423, 430, 435, 438, 439, 450, 485, 515, 543, 566, 567, 623, 628, 790, 795, 802, 819, 866
Bois, Jules, 849
Bois, Simon du, 157
Boisgobey, Fortuné du, 724
Boisrobert, 272, 297, 298, 364, 366, 385
Boissier, Gaston, 815
Boistuau, Pierre, 172
Bolingbroke, 462, 505, 511
Bonald, Louis de, 603, *604*, 630, 639, 775
Bonaparte, Mme Joseph, 587
Bonarelli, Guidobaldo, 285
Bonaventure, St., 93
Boniface of Montferrat, 57
Bonjour, Casimir, 704
Bonnard. Abel, 849
Bonnetain, Paul, 767

Bonnivet, 159
Booth, John Wilkes, 308
Bordeaux, duc de, 631
Bordeaux, Henry, 841, 849
Borderie, Jean de la, 153
Borel, Petrus, 663
Bornier, Henri de, 788
Bossuet, 105, 220, 223, 255, 256, 271, 331, *388–398*, 400, 401, 402, 404, 429, 431, 454, 503, 567, 588, 623, 633, 819, 866
Bossuet, abbé, 402
Botrel, Théodore, 850
Bouchardy, Joseph, 663, 695
Bouchart, 151
Boucher, 538, 564, 764
Bouchet, Guillaume, 173
Bouchet, Jean, 121, 174
Bouchor, Maurice, 741, 850
Bouciquaut, 59
Boufflers, chevalier de, 569
Bouhélier, Saint-Georges de (Georges de Bouhélier-Lepelletier), 840, *860*
Bouhours, the P., 382, 386, 421, 439
Bouilhet, Louis, 788, 790
Bouillon, duchesse de, 357, 411, 435, 436
Boukay, Maurice. See Couyba
Boulanger, Louis, 661
Bourbon, duc de, 428, 495
Bourbon, Nicolas, 175
Bourdaloue, 388, 389, *396–398*, 400, 406, 431
Bourdelot, abbé, 419
Bourgeois, Léon, 840
Bourges, Elémir, 850
Bourget, Paul, 713, 741, 849, *850–851*
Bourgogne, duc de, 390, 400, 402, 404, 405
Boursault, 368, 476
Bourzeys, abbé de, 338, 386
Boutelleau, Georges, 851
Boutroux, Emile, 831, 851
Bouvier, Alexis, 724
Boyer, 448, 796
Boylesve, René, 852
Bradstreet, Mrs., 225
Brakespeare, Nicholas, 102
Brantôme, 243–244, 251
Brazier, 694
Brébeuf, 439
Briand, Aristide, 840
Briçonnet, 157, 221
Brieux, Eugène, 843, 852
Brifaut, 607
Brinvilliers, Mme de, 358, 398, 414
Brisson, A., 787, 844, 848, 852
Brisson, Henri, 840
Brissot, 592, 594
Brizeux, Auguste, 681, 724
Brodeau, Victor, 153, 282
Broglie, duc de, 632, 814, 816
Brossette, 377
Broussais, 645, 657
Browne, Sir Thomas, 239
Bruant, Aristide, 808
Brucker, 199
Brunck, 575
Brunetière, Ferdinand, 208, 234, 255, 276, 280, 321, 369, 655, 810, *818–821*, 838, 853, 856, 866
Brunetto Latini, 107
Brutus, 267
Buchanan, George, 211, 231
Buckle, 746, 747
Budé, 127, 131, 132, 133, 137, 138, *139–142*, 164, 204
Buffet, 816
Buffon, 448, 543, *557–559*, 561, 571, 579, 628, 731
Buhle, 199
Buloz, François, 736
Bulwer, 849
Burckhardt, 129
Buridan, 95
Burns, Robert, 846
Burton, 239
Bussy-Rabutin, 414, 423, *425*
Buttet, Claude de, 177
Buzot, 592
Byng, 509
Byron, 572, 624, 651, 655, 657, 658, 659, 661, 662, 663, 664, 667, 668, 672, 675, 697, 700, 723

C

Cabanis, *602*
Cabanis, Mme, 601
Cabet, Etienne, 647, 767
Caecilia Metella, 614
Caesar, 4, 36, 243, 267, 740
Caffaro, 391
Cagliostro, 710
Caigniez, 693, 694
Caillavet, Gaston-Armand de, 852, 858
Caius Gracchus, 555
Calas, 509
Calderón, 491
Callias, Nina de, 795
Calvin, 132, 152, 158, 171, 200, 220, *221–224*, 252, 339, 395
Campistron, 360
Camus, 285, 286
Capus, Alfred, 852
Carel de Sainte-Garde, 290
Carlyle, 590, 729
Caro, 537, 789, 811
Caron, Louis le, 177

Carrel, Armand, 644, 735, 743
Cartier, Jean-Hippolyte, 822
Casanova, 64
Casaubon, 205, 429
Cassagnac, Paul de, 822
Cassagne, A., 710
Cassiodorus, 12, 100
Castellion, 222
Castelvetro, 214
Castiglione, 159, 168
Castillon, 388
Catherine, Empress, 450, 513, 536, 550
Catherine, Saint, 401
Catullus, 577
Causse, Charles. See Maël, Pierre
Caylus, comte de, 574
Cazalis, Henri, 796, 798
Caze, Robert, 800
Céard, Henry, 767
Cellini, Benvenuto, 134, 371
Cellot, Louis, 318, 319
Cérizay, 272
Cervantes, 491
Challemel-Lacour, 817
Chambers, Ephraim, 541
Chamfort, 422, 460, 569, *595–596*
Champion, Edme, 529
Champmeslé, la, 352, 377
Champsaur, Félicien, 841
Chantal, Mme de, 346, 412
Chantavoine, Henri, 853
Chapelain, 213, 214, 253, 270, 272, *274–276*, 278, 290, 295, 312, 317, 383, 406, 412
Chapelle, 329, 366, 376
Chappuzeau, 477
Chardin, 496, 538
Charlemagne, 7, 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 39, 87, 97, 305
Charles I, of England, 272, 393
Charles V, 59, 114, 115, 118, 119, 762
Charles V, the emperor, 148
Charles VI, 60, 80, 116
Charles VIII, 61, 117, 132, 137
Charles IX, 178, 180, 196, 244
Charles X, 630, 635, 702, 735
Charles XII of Sweden, 514
Charles d'Anjou, 46
Charles d'Orléans, 117, 122
Charles le Chauve, 7, 8, 52, 88
Charles le Téméraire, 61
Charles Martel, 19, 24
Charles, Mme, 666
Charles-Brun, 448
Charlevoix, Père, 617
Charmes, Francis, 853
Charpentier, Gustave, 806
Charpentier, Jacques, 202
Charron, 240, 251, 335, 342, 345
Chartier, Alain, 117, *120–122*, 144, 150, 213
Chasles, Philarète, 625, 736
Chastellain, Georges, 145
Chateaubriand, 45, 235, 532, 605, 606, 607, 614, *616–625*, 650, 651, 652, 653, 657, 666, 672, 683, 696, 708, 726, 727, 743, 759, 869
Châtelain de Couci, 46
Châtelet, M. du, 528
Châtelet, Mme du, 467, 507, 520, 528
Châtillon, Auguste de, 796
Chatrian, Alexandre, 774
Chatterton, 568, 608, 674
Chaucer, 38, 70, 112
Chaulieu, 440, 462
Chaulnes, duc de, 582, 583
Chênedollé, 607, 608, 658, 666
Chénier, André, 186, 567, 568, 572, *575–579*, 580, 587, 653, 671, 674, 677, 805, 806
Chénier, G. de, 576
Chénier, M.-J., 579, 580, 596, 605
Chénin, Emile, 872
Cherbuliez, Victor, 773
Chesterfield, Lord, 496
Chevalier, Michel, 736
Chevreuse, Mme de, 312, 409, 426
Chigi, Cardinal, 370
Choisy, Mme de, 410
Chopin, 715, 718
Chrestien, Florent, 177, 214, 224, 247
Chrestien, Nicolas, 294
Chrétien de Troyes, 29, 30, *31–36*, 44, 46, 54
Christina, queen of Sweden, 323
Christine de Pisan, 59, 116, *117–120*, 213
Chrysoloras, 137
Cicero, 3, 12, 109, 116, 203, 263, 687, 815
Cladel, Léon, 778
Clairon, Mlle, 470
Clamenges, 95, 116, 136
Claretie, Jules, 853
Claude, Queen, 151
Claudel, Paul, 853
Clavijo, 581
Clemenceau, 822, 823, 839
Clement XI, 501
Cléon, 588
Clerke, Dr., 367
Clermont, Emile, 841
Clermont, Mlle de, 495
Clotaire, 15, 16
Clovis, 16
Cochin, Denys, 853
Col, Gonthier, 116, 120
Colardeau, 565, 568, 569, 573
Colbert, 256, 274, 420
Coleridge, 572
Colet, Mme Louise, 790

Colin Muset, 46
Colletet, François, 268
Colletet, Guillaume, 268, 297
Collin d'Harleville, 596
Combes, 839
Commines, *61*
Compayré, 349
Comte, Auguste, 548, *646–646*, 747, 752, 760, 810, 812, 813
Concini, 261, 279
Condé, prince de, 390, 394, 428, 430, 462
Condé, princesse de, 253
Condillac, abbé de, 519, *646–647*, 554, 601, 640, 746, 747
Condorcet, 444, 547, *653–654*, 587, 601, 644
Condorcet, Mme de, 587, 601
Congreve, 506
Conon de Béthune, 46
Conrart, Valentin, 272, 273, 274, 278, 281
Considérant, Victor, 647, 767
Constant, Benjamin, 610, 611, *615*, 625, *630*, 644, 763, 841
Conti, prince de, 334, 363, 411, 493
Cook, Captain, 561
Coolus, Romain, 843, 853
Cooper, James Fenimore, 697, 708, 720
Cop, Nicolas, 222
Copernicus, 830
Coppée, François, 742, 788, 796, *798*, 799, 806
Coquerel, Athanase, 816
Coran, Charles, 796
Coras, 290
Corbière, Tristan, 804
Corbinelli, Jean, 423
Corday, Charlotte, 308, 593
Cordier, Maturin, 223, 231
Cormenin, 736
Corneille, Pierre, 210, 213, 265, 271, 274, 278, 287, 293, 296, 297, 298, 301, 302, 303, *305–319*, 335, 344, 350, 351, 353, 354, 356, 359, 363, 364, 373, 381, 383, 407, 410, 456, 468, 469, 470, 471, 477, 491, 515, 580, 605, 607, 654, 687, 697, 788, 866, 878
Corneille, Thomas, *303–304*, 308, 360, 361, 364, 386, 409, 422, 456, 457, 467, 476
Corrozet, Gilles, 162
Coste, 448
Cotin, 274, 278, 420
Cottin, Mme, 606
Cotton, P., 347
Coulevain, Hélène Favre de. See Coulevain, Pierre de
Coulevain, Pierre de, 853
Courbet, 759
Courier, Paul-Louis, *630–631*
Courteline, Georges, 853
Courval-Sonnet, 291
Cousin, Victor, 412, 639, *641–643*, 647, 670, 726, 734, 740, 747, 748, 753, 790, 811, 814, 829, 833
Coustel, 349
Couyba, Maurice, 850
Cowley, 225
Cowper, 572
Cranmer, 395
Crashaw, 268
Crébillon, *467–468*
Crébillon (fils), 460, 489, 675, 739, 875
Crémieux, Hector, 739
Cretin, 132, 145, 189
Crévier, 501
Croisset, Francis de. See Wiener, F.
Cromwell, 493
Cros, Charles, 804
Croy, Henry de, 145
Cubières, 488
Cujas, 200, 245
Curchod, 465
Curel, François de, 854
Cusanus, Nicholas, 156, 157
Custine, Mme de, 621
Cuvelier de Trye, 693
Cuvillier-Fleury, 736
Cyrano de Bergerac, *268–269*, 281, 288, 298, 320, 345, 355, 515

D

Dacier, André, 406, 420
Dacier, Mme, 417, 461
Dacquin, Mlle Jenny, 715
Daguesseau, *500*, 542
Danchet, 361
Dancourt, 477, 478, 482
Dangeau, 432
Daniel, Samuel, 198
Dante, 103, 107, 119, 151, 155, 159, 595, 638, 655, 666, 721, 799
Danton, *691*, 592, 594, 596
Darwin, Charles, 728, 759, 819
Daubenton, 557
Daudet, Alphonse, *770–778*, 799, 846, 854
Daudet, Alphonse, Mme, 854
Daudet, Ernest, 855
Daudet, Léon, 823, 838, 854
Daudin, Jean, 115
Daunou, 602
David, Félicien, 644
David, Jacques-Louis, 208, 575
David d'Angers, 661
David de Dinant, 89
Decourcelle, 695, 854

Deffand, Mme du, 460, 462, 463, 514, 550
Dejob, Charles, 265
Delacroix, 661
Delarue-Mardrus, Lucie, 842, 854
Delaunay, Mlle. See Staal-Delaunay, Mme de
Delavigne, Casimir, 683, 697, 704
Delbousquet, Emmanuel, 854
Delille, *570–572*, 587, 595, 607, 687
Della Rocca de Vergalo, 802
Delorme, Marion, 410
Democritus, 429
Demosthenes, 207
Denis, Mme, 467, 508, 513
Denisot, Nicolas, 177
Dennery, Adolphe, 695
Déroulède, Paul, 854
Désaugiers, 608, 680, 704
Des Barreaux, Jacques, 268
Desbordes-Valmore, Mme Marceline, 681
Descartes, 88, 199, 236, 254, 255, 270, 271, 273, *321–330*, 336, 345, 348, 349, 384, 413, 431, 443, 444, 541, 547, 558, 639, 812, 831, 833
Descaves, Lucien, 767, 855, 856
Deschamps, Antony, 658, 796
Deschamps, Emile, 658, 796
Deschamps, Eustache, 45, *113–114*, 123
Deschamps, Gaston, 842
Deschanel, Emile, 652, 821
Deschanel, Paul, 855
Desfontaines (dramatist), 314, 319
Desfontaines (journalist), 466, 516
Deshoulières, Mme, 358, 411, *417–418*, 434
Desjardins, Hortense, 410
Desjardins, Paul, 855
Desmaizeaux, 448
Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin, 286, 289, 298, 299, 385
Desmasures, Louis, 177, 184, 224
Desmoulins, Camille, *693–694*
Desnoyers, Charles, 695
Despautère, 348
Despax, Emile, 855
Desportes, Philippe, 177, 189, 190, *197*, 225, 252, 256, 257, 259, 261, 263, 266
Despréaux. See Boileau
Destouches, 448, 482
Destouches, chevalier, 462, 550
Destutt de Tracy, *602*
Dévérias, the, 661
Diane de Poitiers, 153, 156
Dickens, 369, 722, 759, 770
Diderot, 449, 450, *483–486*, 489, 513, 519, 520, 523, 524, *536–545*, 547, 551, 572, 583, 590, 650, 691, 779, 860
Didon, Henri, 816
Dierx, Léon, 796, 855
Diocletian, 623
Diodorus Siculus, 207
Diomed, 211
Dion Cassius, 215
Dionysius the Areopagite, 88, 92
Dolce, Lodovico, 210
Dolet, Etienne, 132, 133, 142, 143
Donatus, 211
Dondey, Théophile, 663
Donnay, Maurice, *855–856*
Dorat, Claude-Joseph, *568–569*, 573
Dorat, Jean, 177, 178, *180*, 190, 197, 204
Dorchain, Auguste, 856
Dorimond, 366, 367, 370
Dorval, Mme, 674, 695
Dostoyevski, 843
Doublet de Breuillepont, Mme, 465
Doudan, 689, 814
Doumic, 449, 843, *856*
Dreyfus, Alfred, 754, 768, 798, 817, 820, 823, *827–828*, 837, 838, 848, 855, 860, 861, 867, 868
Dreyfus, Henry. See Fursy
Drouet, Mme, 690
Droz, Gustave, 739
Drumont, Edouard, 823, 827
Dryden, 265, 365, 700
Dubois, Cardinal, 471, 491
Du Bos, abbé, 500
Du Camp, Maxime, 657, 661, 662, 663
Du Cange, 420
Ducange, 693, 695
Duchâtel, Pierre, 138, 140
Duché, 361
Duchesne, Mgr, 835, 856, 868
Ducis, Jean-François, *474–475*
Duclos, 447, *549–550*
Ducray-Duminil, 606, 693, 694, 720
Dudevant, baron, 715
Du Fresne, 362, 496
Dufresny, 478, 479
Du Lorens, 258, 291, 370
Dumas, A. (fils), 716, 757, 779, *781–784*, 785, 788, 842
Dumas, A. (père), 298, 652, 660, 661, 677, 691, 696, *697–699*, 700, 703, 709, *710–711*, 723, 736, 770
Dumesnil, Mlle, 469
Dumont, abbé, 669
Dunoyer, Olympe, 505
Duns Scotus, 92, 93, 94, 96
Dupanloup, 638, 751, 816
Du Perron, Cardinal, 177, 256, *259*, 392
Dupin de Francueil, Mme, 449
Dupont de Nemours, 551
Dupont, Pierre, 799

Durand, Mme, 410
Duranty, Edmond, *760*
Duras, Mme de, 621
Durkheim, Emile, 813, 832
Duruy, Victor, 740, 814
Dussault, 605
Duval, Alexandre, 607
Duvergier de Hauranne, 652

E

Ebroin, 54
Edward III of England, 60
Edwards, Jonathan, 333
Eimery, Mme, 873
Einhard, 12, 23, 52
Eisen, 568
Eleanor of Aquitaine, 30, 32, 44
Eliot, George, 761
Elizabeth, Princess, 322
Elskamp, Max, 805
Emerson, 5, 239
Empis, 704
Enault, Louis, 778
Enfantin, 644, 645, 717, 719
Enghien, duc d', 618
Epictetus, 569
Epinay, Mme d', 465, 520, 523, 546
Erasmus, 127, 135, 136, 137, *138*, 141, 142, 143, 167, 238, 509, 873
Erckmann, Emile, 774
Ermoldus Nigellus, 52
Ernest-Charles, Jean, 857
Escobar, 341
Escousse, 662
Esparbès, Georges d', 857
Esprit, abbé, 411, 426
Essarts, Emmanuel des, 796
Estaunié, Edouard, 349, 857
Esterhazy, Major, 827
Estienne, Henri I, 204
Estienne, Henri II, 136, 183, 189, 190, 192, *204–206*, 224
Estienne, Robert, 204
Estissac, Geoffroy d', 164
Etienne, 607
Eugénie, Empress, 714, 773
Euripides, 210, 211, 215, 687, 794, 849
Evrard de Béthune, 95, 100

F

Fabié, François, 857
Fabre d'Eglantine, 596
Fabre, Emile, 843, 857
Fabre, Ferdinand, 772, 841
Faciot, 175
Fagon, 433
Faguet, 448, 577, 689, 783, *857–858*, 877
Fail, Noël du, 173
Falkner, 506
Falloux, comte de, 635, 638
Farel, Guillaume, 221, 222
Faret, 268
Faro, St., 16
Farrère, Claude. See **Bargone, F.**
Fauchet, Claude, 246
Fauchois, René, 858
Faure, Félix, 768
Fauriel, 602
Fauris de Saint-Vincens, 502
Favart, 486, *487*
Favart, Mme, 487
Favre, Jules, 816
Féletz, 605
Fénelon, 387, 390, 391, 396, *400–408*, 429, 430, 439, 503, 867
Ferdinand of Parma, 546
Ferriol, M. de, 464
Ferriol, Mme de, 464
Ferry, Jules, 814, 817
Fertiault, P., 796
Feugère, Anatole, 397, 398
Feuillet, Octave, *773*, 779, 784
Feutry, 565
Féval, Paul, 723
Feydeau, Ernest, 763, 858
Feydeau, Georges, 858
Fichet, Guillaume, 136
Fichte, 530, 610, 728, 752
Ficino, Marsilio, 156, 157
Fielding, 491, 492
Fiesque, Mme de, 410
Firenzuola, 258
Flaubert, 656, 716, 740, 757, 758, 759, *760–768*, 764, 765, 769, 790
Flavio Blondi, 498
Fléchier, 105, 398, 399
Flers, Robert de. See **Caillavet**
Fleury, Jean, 777
Flodoardus, 52
Florian, 486, 563, *573–574*
Florio, 239
Florus, 498
Foerster, 29, 32, 33
Fogazzaro, 836
Foigny, Gabriel de, 446
Folquet de Marseille, 44
Fonsegrive, Georges, 835
Font, 486
Fontainas, André, 805
Fontaine, Charles, 153
Fontanes, 605, 624

Fontenelle, 361, 386, 430, 443, 444, 446, 451, 453, 455, *456–458*, 461, 462, 548
Force, Mlle de la, 410
Forni, Jules, 796
Fort, Paul, 843, 858
Fouillée, 813, 859
Foulque de Neuilly, 105
Fouquet, 366, 414, 435
Fourier, 628, *646–647*, 767, 793
Fourneau, Léon. See Xanrof
Foy, General, 631
France, Anatole, 166, 289, 556, 796, 818, 840, *859–861*, 864
Francis I, 127, 131, 132, 133, 137, 139, 140, 141, 142, 149, 150, 151, 156, 158, 175, 191, 222, 243, 701
Francis II, 178
François, A., 651
Franklin, Benjamin, 464, 602
Frapié, Léon, 861
Freculphus of Lisieux, 52
Fredegarius, 17, 51
Frederick the Great, 450, 508, 513, 550
Freppel, 817
Fréron, 466, 516, 605
Freycinet, Charles de, 817
Froebel, 531
Froissart, *59–60*, 61, 112
Fromentin, Eugène, 772
Fulbert, 13
Fulgence, 704
Furetière, 288, 355, 376, 439
Fursy, 808
Fuselier, 486
Fustel de Coulanges, *815*

G

Gaboriau, Emile, 724
Gace Brulé, 45, 46
Gaguin, Robert, 59, 136
Gaiffe, 484, 692, 693, 694
Galen, 99, 374
Galeotto del Carreto, 210
Galiani, 459, 462, 464
Galileo, 335
Gall, 602, 645
Gallifet, marquise de, 739
Galloix, Imbert, 663
Gambetta, 771, 784, 816, 817, 822
Gandillot, Léon, 862
Garguille, Gautier, 294
Garnier, Robert, 177, *214–215*, 292, 302
Garnier de Pont-Sainte-Maxence, 54
Gassendi, 268, *328–329*, 346, 443
Gaston-Phébus of Foix, 59
Gaucher de Denain, 35
Gautier d'Arras, 36
Gautier de Coinci, 46, 55
Gautier d'Espinau, 46
Gautier, Mme Judith, 862
Gautier, Léon, 19, 22
Gautier, Théophile, 289, 655, 656, 658, 661, 663, 668, *678–679*, 736, 740, 757, 759, 777, 790, 791, 792, 795, 796, 799, 817, 821, 848, 862, 877
Gauthier-Villars, Henry, 880
Gay, 506
Gay, Delphine, 736
Geffrei Gaimar, 56
Geffroy, Gustave, 862
Gellert, 450
Gemistus Pletho, 137, 156
Genest abbé, 462
Genlis, Mme de, 587
Gensonnet, 592
Gentil-Bernard, 569
Geoffrey of Monmouth, 28, 29, 56
Geoffrin, Mme, 457, 462, 463, 546, 550, 879
Geoffroy, 605
George I, of England, 322
Georges, Mlle, 607
Gérard, Rosemonde, 878
Gerbert (continuer of Chrétien de Troyes), 35
Gerbert (Sylvester II), 13
Gerson, 95, 116, 120, 136, 391
Gervaise, 107
Gessner, 450, 561, 564, 572, 573, 650
Geulincx, 326
Ghil, René, 805, 875
Gibbon, 455, 465, 609, 614
Gide, André, 841, 862
Gilbert, 473, 477, 567, *568*, 570, 579, 674
Gilebert de Berneville, 46
Gillot, Jacques, 247
Ginguené, 449, 602
Giraldi Cinthio, 210, 214
Girardin, Emile de, 678, 723, 735, 736, 821, 822
Giry, 272
Gissing, 625
Glatigny, Albert, 796
Gluck, 575
Gobineau, comte de, 726
Godard, Jean, 217
Godeau, 272, 281, 290
Godefroi de Lagny, 33
Goethe, 113, 226, 370, 450, 510, 530, 581, 614, 655, 697, 746, 861, 872
Goëzman, M., 583, 585
Goëzman, Mme, 583
Gohier, Urbain, 823

Gohin, F., 163
Goldoni, 450, 514
Gombauld, 272, 278, 301
Gomberville, *286*
Goncourt, the brothers, 656, 679, 740, 744, 758, 760, 762, *763–765*, 772, 773, 776, 786, 800, 801
Gondi. See Retz, cardinal de
Gondinet, Edmond, 788
Gonzague, Anne de, 394
Gonzague, Marie de, 709
Gotha, Duke of, 551
Gottsched, 450
Goudeau, Emile, 808
Goulard, Simon, 245
Gourmont, Remy de, 862
Gournay, M. de, 552
Gournay, Mlle de, 233, 254, 264, *266*, 288
Gourville, 423
Gouvéa, André, 231
Gower, 77
Grabbe, Christian, 371
Graffigny, Mme de, 514
Grande Mademoiselle, the, 423, 440
Granet, abbé, 466
Gratry, 638, 811
Gray, Thomas, 263, 449, 488, 650
Gréard, Octave, 814
Greban, Arnoul, 78
Greban, Simon, 78
Gregh, Fernand, 840, 862
Gregorio Corraro, 210
Gregory IX, 97
Gregory Nazianzen, 367
Gregory of Tours, 51, 727
Grenier, 488
Grenier, Edouard, 796, 799
Gresset, Jean-Baptiste-Louis, 488
Grétry, 488
Greuze, 538
Gréville, Henry, 777
Grévin, Jacques, 214, 216, 224
Grignan, comte, 412
Grignan, Mme de, 327, 412, 414
Grimm, baron, 450, 465, 487, 519, 520, 523, 551
Grimm, the brothers, 802, 870
Gringore, 79, 83
Gröber, 22
Gros Guillaume, 294
Grotto, Luigi, 285
Grouchy, 231
Gua de Malves, abbé, 541
Guadet, 592
Guaita, Stanislas de, 807
Guarini, 239, 285
Guéneau de Montbeillard, 558
Guérente, 231
Guérin, Eugénie de, 724, 775
Guérin, Maurice de, 636, 724, 775
Guerne, vicomte de, 863
Guevara, 490
Guibert, comte de, 464
Guibourg, abbé, 358
Guiches, Gustave, 767
Guido delle Colonne, 38
Guillaume d'Auvergne, 92, 105
Guillaume de Champeaux, 89, 90, 97
Guillaume de Conches, 89
Guillaume de Nangis, 57
Guillaume de Provence, 24
Guillaume de Saint-Amour, 47
Guillaume de Toulouse, 24
Guillaume Durant, 102
Guillaume le Clerc, 107
Guillaume le Maréchal, 56
Guillaumin, Emile, 863
Guillén de Castro, 311
Guillet, Pernette du, 162
Guillot Gorju, 294
Guimond de la Touche, 474
Guinon, Albert, 863
Guizot, 613, 629, 630, 632, *633–634*, 667, 731, 732, 734, 781, 815
Guttinguer, Ulric, 658
Guy of Blois, 59
Guy Patin, 328
Guyau, Jean-Marie, *813–814*
Guyon, Mme, 158, 347, 391, 396, *401–402*, 405
Gyp. See Mirabeau de Martel, comtesse de

H

Habert, 272
Hachette, 767, 778
Haeckel, 819
Haillan, Girard du, 242
Halévy, 739, 774, 779, 785
Hall, Bishop, 429
Haller, 450, 535
Hamon, 350
Hanotaux, Gabriel, 863
Haraucourt, Edmond, 863
Hardy, Alexandre, *293–294*, 297, 300, 302, 318
Harry, Myriam, 842, 863
Hauptmann, 843
Hauréau, 96
Haussmann, baron, 738
Haussonville, comte de Cléron d', 863
Hauteroche, 476
Hawker, R. S., 34
Hazlitt, 239

Hébert, 593, 594
Hecker, Father, 833
Hegel, 641, 729, 746, 748, 752, 776, 829
Heine, 123
Heinrich der Glichzâre, 63
Heinsius, 296
Helgaldus, 53
Hélinand de Froidmont, 105
Heliodorus, 207
Héloïse, 90, 527
Helvétius, 464, 513, 539, 542, 546, *647–648*, 601, 711
Helvétius, Mme, 548, 587
Hénault, 461, 463
Hennique, Léon, 767
Henri d'Andeli, 69, 95
Henri de Champagne, 44
Henri de Valenciennes, 58
Henry I, of England, 107
Henry II, 156, 178
Henry II, of England, 30, 32, 44, 102
Henry III, 179, 180, 189, 697
Henry III, of England, 56
Henry IV, 208, 228, 243, 244, 247, 251–260, 264, 277, 286, 347, 393, 516, 662
Henry d'Albret, 159
Henry of Ghent, 92
Henriette d'Angleterre, 356, 390, 393, 398, 414
Henriette de France, 390, 393
Heraclitus, 429, 538
Herbart, 530
Herder, 530, 602, 727, 728, 729, 746, 752
Heredia, 226, 572, 796, 797, 865
Héricart, Marie, 434
Hermant, Abel, *864*
Hermonymus of Sparta, 137
Herodotus, 205, 395, 631
Héroët, Antoine, 162, 163, 174, 181, 184
Hérold, A.-Ferdinand, 864
Hervart, d', 435
Hervé, Edouard, 821, 822
Hervé, Gustave, 823
Hervey, James, 565
Hervieu, Paul, 843, *864–865*
Hesiod, 687, 794
Heywood, 84
Hichens, Robert, 872
Hilarius, 72
Hildebert, 47, 105
Hildegarius of Meaux, 16
Hincmar of Rheims, 52
Hippocrates, 99, 374
Hirsch, 508
Hirsch, Charles-Henry, 840
Hobbes, 396, 525, 529, 541, 548
Hoffman, 605
Hoffmann, 658, 659
Holbach, baron d', 464, 546, *649*, 711
Homer, 16, 37, 96, 109, 121, 185, 226, 265, 389, 404, 405, 408, 457, 577, 623, 687, 794
Honorius III, 97
Honorius Augustodunensis, 102
Horace, 87, 95, 109, 185, 187, 188, 192, 211, 257, 264, 266, 377, 381, 382, 580, 687, 794
Hospital, Michel de l', 187, 192, 204, 247, 500
Hotman, François, 200, 245–246, 247
Houdetot, Mme d', 520, 521, 522, 528
Houdoy, 67
Houssaye, Arsène, 777, 796, 865
Houssaye, Henry, 865
Houtin, abbé, 835
Houville, Gérard d'. See Régnier, Mme Henri de
Hruodlandus, 23
Huet, Daniel, 329, 411, 415, *420*
Hugo Farsitus, 55
Hugo, Victor, 228, 299, 308, 316, 317, 353, 360, 470, 517, 570, 590, 616, 625, 629, 637, 640, 652, 653, 654, 655, 658, 659, 661, 664, 670, 675, 677, 681, *682–690*, 691, 694, 695, *700–703*, 709, 710, 713, 723, 724, 735, 737, 742, 743, 767, 769, 772, 787, 788, 790, 792, 795, 796, 877, 878
Hugues d'Orléans, 48
Hugues de Saint-Victor, 89
Hugues le Primat, 48
Hulst, Mgr d', 835
Hume, 494, 521, 523, 640, 812
Humières, Robert d', 865
Hurtado de Mendoza, 366
Huysmans, J.-K., 767, 774, 775, *776–777*, 801, 803, 855, 872
Huzard, Mme Antoinette, 880

I

Ibsen, 805, 847, 850, 870, 876
Innocent IV, 57, 104
Innocent X, 338
Ireland, Archbishop, 833
Isidore of Seville, 12, 100
Ives, Charlotte, 621

J

Jacobi, 530
Jacot de Forest, 38
Jacquemart Gelée, 64, 66
Jacques de Vitry, 105, 106
James VI, of Scotland, 225

James, Henry, 851
James, William, 829, 830, 835
Jammes, Francis, 865
Jamyn, Amadis, 177, 197
Janet, 353, 811
Janin, Jules, 736, 821
Jansenius, *335*, 335, 342
Jarry, Alfred, 787
Jaucourt, chevalier de, 543
Jaurès, 823, 839
Jean II, 111, 115
Jean de Condé, 69
Jean de Monstereul, 109, 114, 115, *116*, 120, 131, 136
Jean le Bel, 59, 60
Jeanne de Navarre, 58
Jeanroy, 42
Jehan de Thuin, 39
Jerome, St., 52
Jodelet, 299
Jodelle, 177, 178, 181, 184, 194, 214, 216, 217
John of Salisbury, 101, *102*, 114
Johnson, Dr., 460
Joinville, 51, *68* 60
Jolyot, Prosper. See Crébillon
Jonson, Ben, 239, 265
Jordan, Camille, 632
Joubert, 389, *605–606*, 624
Jouffroy, Théodore, 643
Jouy, Jules, 808
Juda Abarbanel. See Léon Hébreu
Julian the Apostate, 673
Julius II, 83
Julius Valerius, 37
Jurieu, 451, 453, 454
Jusserand, J.-J., 267
Justel, Henri, 419
Justin, 121
Juvenal, 48, 87, 109, 229, 257, 291, 381, 382

K

Kahn, Gustave, 802, 803, 805, 807
Kant, 92, 530, 752, 811, 812, 830, 831
Karr, Alphonse, 724
Kean, 697
Keith, Lord, 523
Kemble, 697
Kingsley, Charles, 636, 762
Kipling, 237
Kistemaeckers, Henry, 865
Klein, abbé, 834
Klopstock, 450
Kock, Paul de, 723
König, 508
Kornman, 582
Krüdener, Mme de, 606
Krysinska, Marie, 802, 808

L

La Barre, de, 509
La Baume, Mme de, 425
Labé, Louise, 160
La Beaumelle, 516
Laberthonnière, Père, 835
Labiche, 373, 779, *784–785*, 788, 862
La Blache, comte de, 582, 583
Laboulaye, Edouard de, 821
La Bourdonnaye, comte de, 630
La Bruyère, Jean de, 150, 236, 281, 386, 397, 412, 423, *428–431*, 457, 502, 503, 571, 814
La Calprenède, *286–287*, 298, 450, 468
Lacaussade, Auguste, 794
La Chaise, P., 348
La Chaussée, Pierre-Claude Nivelle de, *482–483*, 866
Lachelier, Jules, 811
Laclos, Choderlos de, 489, 875
La Combe, Père, 402
Lacordaire, 635, 636, *637–638*, 736, 737, 833
Lacroix, Paul, 711
Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye, 488
Lacuzon, Adolphe, 840
La Fare, marquis de, 411, 440
La Fayette, Mme de, 288, 398, 412, *414–415*, 418, 427, 440
Lafenestre, Georges, 796, 865
La Ferté-Imbault, Mme de 463,
La Fontaine, 62, 70, 151, 276, 281, 378, 380, 406, 411, 430, *434–439*, 573, 574, 687, 721, 749, 865
Laforgue, Jules, 802, 805
La Fosse, 361
Lagrange, 601
Lagrange-Chancel, 360
La Harpe, Jean-François de, 422, 474, 513, 601
Lahor, Jean. See Cazalis
Lally-Tollendal, 509
Lamarck, 538
Lamartine, 257, 568, 572, 580, 590, 607, 628, 660, 664, *666–671*, 674, 675, 677, 683, 685, 790, 791, 793, 795, 796, 868, 874
Lamber, Juliette. See Adam, Mme
Lambert, Mme de, 457, 459, *461*, 495, 565
Lambert le Tort, 39
Lamennais, 628, *635–637*, 639, 715, 717, 736, 737, 743, 745, 833
La Mesnardière, 295
La Mettrie, 450, 548, 549
Lamoignon, de, 370, 377

La Monnoye, Bernard de, 420
La Mothe le Vayer, 264
La Motte, Houdar de, 361, 387, 444, 461, *488*, *565–566*, 567
Lamy, Etienne, 865
Lamy, Pierre, 164
Lancelot, 349, 350
Lanfranc, 13
Langlois, C.-V., 816, 866
Langlois, Hippolyte, 866
Languet, 246
Lanson, G., 321, 445, 446, 483, 839, 866
Lapauze, Mme Jeanne, 868
La Péruse, 214
La Place, 474
Laplace, 601
Laprade, Victor de, 681
Larévellière-Lépeaux, 533
Larivey, Pierre, *217–218*, 251, 365
La Rochefoucauld, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 423, 424, *426–428*, 429, 430, 502, 503, 548, 558, 595, 606
Laromiguière, 641
Larroumet, 352, 852
La Sablière, Mme de, 411, 435
Lascaris, Janus, 137, 141, 175
La Serre, 314
Lasserre, 654, 662, 664, 676, 728, 838
La Tailhède, Raymond de, 805
Latouche, H. de, 576
Latour, Mme de, 523
Lattaignant, abbé de, 460
Laumonier, P., 177, 193
Laurent, veuve, 459
Lauzun, 413
La Vallière, Mlle de, 369, 390, 411
Lavater, 531
La Vaudère, Jane de, 841
Lavedan, 844, *866*
Lavigerie, Cardinal, 816
Lavisse, 816, 837, 866
Law, John, 479
Laya, 596
Lebaigt, Laurent, 875
Le Barillier, Mme Berthe-Corinne, 849
Leblond, Ary, 866
Leblond, Jean, 150
Leblond, Marius, 866
Le Bossu, Père, 290, 382
Lebras, 662
Le Braz, Anatole, 867
Le Breton, 541, 542
Le Brun-Pindare, 573, 575, 576, 587, 696
Leclerc, 423, 448, 704
Lecomte, Valleran, 293, 300
Leconte de Lisle, 790, 791, *793–794*, 796, 800, 855, 863, 867
Ledru-Rollin, 718, 737
Lee, 210
Lefebure, Eugène, 796
Lefèvre d'Etaples, 133, 137, 157, *220–221*
Lefranc, A., 170
Le Franc, Martin, 117, 150
Le Franc de Pompignan, 447, 516, 567
Le Goffic, Charles, 867
Legouvé, Ernest, 788
Legrand d'Aussy, 488
Le Houx, Jean, 485
Leibnitz, 92, 326, 327, 511, 515
Leigh, Augusta, 662
Le Jay, the P., 505
Le Kain, 470
Le Laboureur, 290
Lélio. See Riccoboni, Luigi
Lemaire de Belges, 127, 132, *146–149*, 150, 151, 152, 174, 182, 196, 200, 404
Le Maître, Antoine, 334, 349, 388
Le Maître de Saci, 334
Lemaître, Frédérick, 695, 696
Lemaître, Jules, 352, 408, 731, 818, 842, *867–868*, 877
Lemercier, Népomucène, 607
Lemerre, Alphonse, 795
Lemire, abbé, 834
Lemoinne, John, 821
Lemonnier, Camille, 805
Lemoyne, André, 796, 799
Lemoyne, Père, 290
Lenglet Dufresnoy, 153
Le Nôtre, 438, 450
Lenôtre, G., 866
Leo archipresbyter, 37
Leo X, 137
Leo XIII, 637, 816, 833
Leo Judæus. See Léon Hébreu
Léon Hébreu, 162, 180
Léonard, 572, 573
Leonardo da Vinci, 134
Leonora, Queen, 152
Leopardi, 794, 876
Lepelletier, Edmond, 796
L'Estoile, 244, 297, 698
Leroux, Pierre, 628, 644, 647, 716, 717, 718, 727, 767
Le Roy, Edouard, 835, 836
Le Roy, Eugène, 868
Le Roy, Louis, 207
Le Roy, Pierre, 247
Lesage, 477, *478–479*, 486, 489, *490–491*
Lespinasse, Julie de, *463–464*, 546, 550, 560, 879
Lesseps, Ferdinand de, 644
Lessing, 315, 450, 473, 614
Lesueur, Daniel. See Lapauze, Mme Jeanne

Le Tellier, Michel, 390, 394
Le Tellier, P., 348
Le Tourneur, 474, 565
Leuven, 710, 877
Levasseur, Thérèse, 519, 520, 521
Lhérie, 877
Liancourt, duc de, 338
Liard, L., 837
Lichtenberger, André, 868
Liégeard, Stéphen, 868
Lillo, 449, 484
Linière, 268
Liszt, 644, 716, 718
Littré, Emile, 645, 760
Livry, de, 877
Livy, 109, 115, 121, 210, 242, 243, 395, 687, 725, 749
Lizet, 132, 221
Locke, 448, 470, 499, 506, 507, 511, 529, 530, 541, 547, 548, 558, 640
Lockroy, 710
Loges, Mme des, *877*
Loisy, abbé, 833, 835, *868–869*
Lombroso, 813
Longfellow, 849
Longinus, 377
Longolius, 142
Longueville, Mlle de, 421. See also Nemours, duchesse de
Longueville, Mme de, 274, 312, 334, 409, 411, 421, 426, 642
Longus, 207, 631
Lope de Vega, 282, 319, 366, 491
Lorde, André de, 787
Loret, *421–422*
Lorris, Guillaume de, 108
Loschi, 209
Lothaire, 7
Loti, Pierre, 858, *869*
Louis VI, 53
Louis VII, 29, 32, 44
Louis IX, 46, 58
Louis XI, 61, 117
Louis XII, 83, 132, 137
Louis XIII, 253, 264, 272, 421, 426, 431, 683
Louis XIV, 130, 253, 254, 256, 294, 348, 350, 356, 395, 399, 402, 405, 411, 416, 423, 428, 431, 433, 438, 439, 445, 446, 450, 452, 459, 462, 480, 496, 501, 514, 735, 818
Louis XV, 497, 508, 581, 775, 873
Louis XVI, 531, 552, 582, 593, 594, 873
Louis XVIII, 613, 629
Louis le Débonnaire, 12, 52
Louis le Germanique, 7, 8
Louis-Philippe, 613, 629, 632, 633, 635, 639, 656, 667, 680, 696, 702, 705, 722, 732, 733, 735, 736, 780
Louise de Savoie, 149, 151, 152, 156, 159
Louveau, Jean, 172
Louvet de Couvray, 490
Louÿs, Pierre, 840, 869
Lowell, J. R., 523
Loyola, 222, 347
Loyson, Hyacinthe, 816
Lucan, 12, 36, 37, 39, 48, 95, 109, 121, 215, 229, 408, 439
Lucas, Dr., 765
Luce de Lancival, 607
Lucian, 172, 264, 406, 569
Lucretius, 329, 507, 577, 797
Lugné-Poé, 843
Lulli, 361
Luther, 138, 220, 221, 395
Luxembourg, Mme de, 520
Luxembourg, M. de, 520
Luynes, duc de, 261, 279, 328
Luzarche, Robert, 796

M

Mabillon, 420
Mably, de, 519, *554–555*, 574, 588
Machault, Guillaume de, 45, 59, *112–113*, 123, 144, 523
Machiavelli, 61
MacMahon, 811, 822
Mac-Nab, Maurice, 808
Macpherson, 608
Macready, 697
Macrobius, 96, 108
Mæcenas, 271
Maël, Pierre, 869
Maeterlinck, 77, 805, *870*
Maffei, 514
Magny, Olivier de, 160, 177, 190, 193, 194, 197
Magre, Maurice, 870
Mahomet, 511
Maigron, 657, 659, 661, 664, 676
Maillard, 105, 144, 391, 397
Maillot, 597
Maimbourg, the P., 452
Maindron, Maurice, 870–871
Maine, duchesse du, 327, 462, 467
Maine de Biran, 640, 641
Maintenon, Mme de, 348, 358, 397, 400, 402, 410, 411, 413, *415–417*, 423, 433, 480. See also Scarron, Mme
Mairet, 210, 214, 294, *297*, 298, 301, 311
Maistre, Joseph de, *603–604*, 610, 630, 639, 775, 838
Maistre, Xavier de, 606
Malakoff, duchesse de, 739

Mâle, M. 101
Malebranche, 255, 256, 326, *330–331*, 345, 349. 384, 431, 437, 456, 567, 673
Malesherbes, 733
Malézieu, 462
Malfilâtre, Clinchamp de, 567, 568
Malherbe, 188, 189, 190, 191, 198, 253, 254, 256, 257, 258, 259, *261–265*, 266, 267, 270, 274, 278, 288, 327, 378, 385, 413, 579
Mallarmé, Stéphane, 796, 803, *804*, 805, 855, 875
Malleville, 272
Malot, Hector, 778
Mambrun, 382
Mancini, Marie, 356, 411
Manhac, Pierre, 116
Manuel, 631
Manuel, E., 798
Manutius, Aldus, 137
Map, Walter, 29, 48
Maquet, Auguste, 663, 710
Marat, 308, 550, 554, 593, 596
Marbode, 105, 107
Marcelin. See Planat, E.
Marcillac, François, prince de. See La Rochefoucauld
Marcus Aurelius, 748, 755, 797
Maréchal, Antoine, 294
Margaret of Austria, 146, 147
Margaret of Scotland, 121
Marguerite de Navarre, 133, 140, 150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, *157–160*, 171, 172, 221, 719
Marguerite de Valois, 243, 244, 286
Margueritte, general, 871
Margueritte, Paul, 767, 871
Margueritte, Victor, 871
Mariana, 347
Marie-Antoinette, 467, 573, 593, 596
Marie de Champagne, 32, 44, 46
Marie de France, 30, 62, 436
Marie Leczinska, 546
Marie-Thérèse, 350, 390, 394
Marillier, 568
Marinetti, F.-T., 871
Marino, 274, 279
Marivaux, 369, *480–482*, 489, *491–498*, 706
Marmontel, 422, 460, 462, 465, 474, 488, 503, 513, 543, *550–551*, 569, 623
Marot, Clément, 46, 108, 127, 133, 145, *149–153*, 154, 160, 174, 184, 185, 221, 224, 257, 259, 435, 436
Marot, Jean, 149
Mars, Mlle, 607
Marsolleau, Louis, 871
Marston, 210
Martelli, Lodovico, 210
Martial, 183
Martianus Capella, 12, 100
Martin, Alexis, 796
Martin, Henri, 732, 733
Marty-Laveaux, Charles, 795
Marullus, 192
Marvell, Andrew, 272
Mary, Queen of Scots, 215
Mascaron, *398*
Massenet, 55
Massillon, 105, 398, 399
Masson, Armand, 808
Masson, Frédéric, 871
Masson-Forestier, 350
Mathieu, G., 799
Mathilde, princesse, 740
Mathiron de Curnieu, Georges. See Ancey, G.
Maturin, C. R., 659, 720
Mauclair, Camille, 871
Maupassant, 70, 491, 609, 767, *769–770*, 772, 840, 873
Maupeou, 583
Maupertius, 450, 508, 516
Maure, Mme de, 410
Maurice de Nassau, 322
Maurice de Sully, 105
Maurras, Charles, 805, 838, *871–878*
Mayeur de Saint-Paul, 692
Maynard, 794
Maynard, François, 265
Mazarin, Cardinal, 253, 294, 306, 316, 356, 357, 361, 411, 421, 424, 425, 426, 439
Mazarin, duchesse de, 383, 411, 435
Mazères, 704
Medici, Catherine de', 229
Médicis, Marie de, 264, 279
Meilhac, 739, 774, 779, 785
Melanchthon, 395
Méline, Jules, 822
Ménage, Gilles, 274, 281, 412, 414, 419, 420, 421, 439
Ménard, Louis, *794–795*, 796
Mendès, Catulle, 739, *795–797*, 798, 858, 862
Mennecier, 35
Menot, 105, 144, 391, 397
Mérat, Albert, 796, 799
Mercier, Sébastien, 485, 690, 693
Méré, chevalier de, 271, 336, 411, 423
Meredith, 758
Mérimée, Prosper, 708, 709, *713–715*, 716, 740, 760, 785, 821
Merlant, J., 626
Merrill, Stuart, 572, 802, 805, 806, 875
Meschinot, 132, 145, 146
Meun, Jean de, 67, 95, *108–110*, 120

Meurice, Paul, 710, 787
Meusy, Victor, 808
Meyer, Arthur, 738, 822
Meyer, Paul, 23
Mézeray, 423
Mézières, Alfred, 872
Michael Angelo, 673, 690
Michaut, 356
Michel (de Bourges), 715, 717, 718
Michel, Jean, 78
Michelet, 40, 114, 127, 445, 628, 726, 727, 728, *729–731*, 732, 752
Middleton, 494
Miesnik, Marie, 560
Mignet, François, 732, 735
Mikhaël, Ephraïm, 805, 875
Mill, John Stuart, 548, 645, 747
Mille, Pierre, 872
Millet, Jacques, 79
Millevoye, 580, 607, 650, 666
Mills, 541
Milton, 225, 507, 517, 623, 687
Minturno, 214
Mirabeau, marquis de, 502, 551, 582, *589–590*, 591, 863, 872
Mirabeau de Martel, comtesse de, 863
Mirabeau-Tonneau, 589, 863
Mirbeau, Octave, 767, 843, 870, 872
Miton, 336, 423
Mockel, Albert, 805
Mogador, Céleste, 739
Moinaux, Georges. See Courteline, Georges
Moinaux, Jules, 788
Molé, M., 672
Molière, 69, 70, 99, 218, 219, 258, 264, 265, 269, 270, 273, 274, 280, 281, 285, 288, 289, 292, 293, 294, 298, 299, 301, 303, 305, 315, 316, 319, 328, 329, 348, 350, 351, 354, 361, *362–375*, 376, 378, 381, 398, 403, 407, 411, 414, 417, 420, 422, 431, 434, 435, 439, 476, 477, 478, 479, 481, 482, 484, 491, 520, 584, 596, 654, 657, 687, 701, 704, 781, 783, 784, 865, 867
Molina, 339
Molinet, Jean, 145, 146, 150, 189
Molinos, 401
Molza, 258
Mondory, 293, 310
Monge, 601
Monluc, 243
Monnier, Henri, 656
Monnier, Mme de, 589
Monod, Gabriel, 339, 816, 866
Montaigne, 166, 170, 201, 211, *231–240*, 251, 252, 254, 266, 271, 323, 328, 335, 336, 342, 345, 421, 430, 445, 454, 495, 503, 530, 625
Montalembert, 636, 638, 833
Montalte, Louis de, 338
Montauron, 305
Montausier, marquis de, 278, 390
Montchrestien, 210, 214, 215, 251, 292
Montégut, Emile, 759, 761, 817
Montégut, Maurice, 872
Montemayor, 285
Montépin, Xavier de, 723
Montespan, Mme de, 358, 398, 411, 416, 428, 462
Montesquieu, 246, 448, 460, 461, *495–501*, 503, 543, 553, 574, 588, 611, 731, 734, 747
Montesquiou-Fezensac, comte Robert de, 872
Montfleury, 293, 364, 368
Montfleury, the younger, 476
Montglat, Mme de, 425
Moore, 484
Mora, marquis de, 464
More, Sir Thomas, 169, 647
Moréas, 572, 801, 805, 846, 871
Moreau, Emile, 872
Moreau, Hégésippe, 681
Moreau, Jacob-Nicolas, 546
Morellet, abbé, 447, 551
Morelly, 555
Morenne, Claude de, 257
Morice, Charles, 805
Moréri, 453
Morley, Henry, 153
Mornet, 651
Morny, duc de, 771
Morny, duchesse de, 739
Moselly, Emile. See Chénin, Emile
Motteux, 448
Motteville, Mme de, 417, 423
Mouchy, Mme de, 621
Moufle d'Angerville, 465
Mun, comte de, 741, 840, 872
Muret, 177, 204, 211, 214, 231
Murger, Henry, 759, 788
Musset, Alfred de, 179, 517, 568, 658, 661, 663, 664, *675–678*, 704, *705–706*, 712, 715, 716, 758, 770, 791, 793, 795, 877
Musurus, Marcus, 175

N

Nadaud, Gustave, 799
Nantes, Mlle de, 428
Nanteuil, Célestin, 663
Napoleon I, 555, 574, 594, 595, 601, 605, 606, 609, 612, 618, 674, 680, 684, 685, 687, 689, 690, 697, 702, 712, 732, 816, 871, 878
Napoleon III, 667, 685, 686, 736, 738, 740, 771, 773, 816

Naudé, Gabriel, 328
Navagero, 192, 194
Necker, 609
Necker, Mme, 465, 557, 587, 609
Nefftzer, Auguste, 821
Nemours, duchesse de, 421. See also Longueville, Mlle de
Nennius, 28
Nero, 355, 356
Nerval, Gérard de, 658, 661, 663, 724, 759, 777
Nesmy, Jean. See Surchamp, H.
Nettement, 735
Nevers, duc de, 357, 411
Newman, Cardinal, 834, 879
Newton, 323, 443, 444, 449, 470, 507, 511, 540, 541, 558
Nézel, Théodore, 695
Nicole, 329, 349, 350, 419
Nicole Bozon, 106
Nicolet, 691, 692
Nietzsche, 239, 841, 843, 857, 862
Ninon de Lenclos, 377, 410, 445, 462, 505
Nisard, 255, 355, 734, 746, 818
Nithardus, 52
Nivardus of Ghent, 63
Noailles, comtesse de, 842, 873
Nodier, Charles, 657, 658, 659, 661, 693, 709, 710
Nolant de Fatouville, 479
Nolhac, Pierre de, 873
Nordau, Max, 806, 856
Normand, Jacques, 873
North, 208
Noue, de la, 243
Novella Andrea, 118
Novelli, 846

O

Obermann. See Senancour
Ockham, William of, 94
Odericus Vitalis, 53
Odon de Cluny, 13
Œcolampadius, 395
Offenbach, Jacques, 739, 785
Ogier, François, 302
Ohnet, Georges, 873
Olivet, d', 445
Olivetanus, 221
Ollivier, Emile, 816, 873
Olympo, 153
Omar Khayyam, 798
Oresme, 114, *115*, 118
Orneval, d', 486
Orosius, 121
Ossian, 561, 621, 650, 666, 675, 714, 794
Otto, King, 776
Otway, 69, 361
Ouville, d', 298
Ovid, 36, 37, 44, 48, 87, 100, 106, 108, 109, 112, 116, 149, 150, 179, 183, 194, 203, 258, 264, 434, 439, 564, 568, 569, 578
Ozanam, Frédéric, 638

P

Pagello, 677, 715
Pailleron, Edouard, 789
Palva, la, 739
Palatine, Princess, 390
Palissot, 525, 789
Palissy, Bernard, 200, 256
Pannard, 486
Paolo Emilio, 242
Papadiamantopoulos. See Moréas, Jean
Parc, Denys Sauvage du, 162
Parc, Mlle du, 305, 352, 358
Paré, Ambroise, 200, 256
Parigot, H., 698
Pâris, diacre, 334
Paris, Gaston, 16, 22, 28, 29, 32, 41, 83, 117
Paris, Paulin, 66
Paris-Duverney, 581, 582
Parny, 572, 578, 650, 666, 793
Parodi, Alexandre, 788
Pascal, 234, 236, 239, 253, 270, 273, 281, 332, *334–344*, 345, 350, 411, 412, 413, 423, 431, 443, 502, 503, 567, 583, 606, 642, 797, 835, 837, 861
Pascal, Jacqueline, 335
Pascal III, 19
Pasquier, Etienne, 121, 133, 136, 149, 161, 174, 177, 194, 200, 204, *206–207*, 234, 245, 246, 251, 339, 347
Passerat, Jean, 177, 247, 256, *259*
Pasteur, 853
Pater, Walter, 764
Patin, Guy, 413
Paul III, 165
Paulet, Mlle de, 279
Paulus Diaconus, 11
Paulyanthe, 696
Pazzi, Alessandro de', 210
Pearl, Cora, 739
Peire Roger, 44
Péladan, Joséphin, 873
Peletier du Mans, 133, 174, *176*, 178, 182, *184–186*, 376
Pelletier, 460
Pellissier, Georges, 873
Pellisson, 272, 281, 290, 295

Pembroke, Countess of, 215
Penthièvre, duc de, 573
Pepin, 11, 19, 52
Pepys, 239, 365, 367
Pericles, 588
Périer, M., 338
Périer, Mme, 335
Périer, Du, 261, 263
Périers, Bonaventure des, 172, 204
Perrault, 191, 290, 386, 418, 439
Perrault, Mme. See Harry, Myriam
Perrin, François, 217
Perrin, Pierre, 361
Persan, Mme de, 465
Persius, 95
Péruse, Jean de la, 177, 178
Pestalozzi, 531
Peter Comestor, 102
Peter Lombard, 92, 101, *103*
Peter of Pisa, 11
Peter Venerable, 47
Petit de Julleville, 22
Petrarch, 91, 112, 114, 115, 116, 147, 150, 156, 161, 183, 188, 196, 198, 210, 523, 614, 666, 687, 872, 873
Petronius, 879
Petrus Hispanus, 100
Peyrebrune, Georges de. See Eimery, Mme
Phædrus, 62
Philippa of Hainaut, 59
Philippe-Auguste, 29, 98
Phillipe de Beaumanoir, 69, 77
Philippe de Grève, 48
Philippe de Nanteuil, 46
Philippe de Thaon, 107
Philippe de Vitry, 123
Philippe le Bel, 58, 82
Philippe Mousket, 56
Philippe, Charles-Louis, 840, 841, 874
Phryne, 856
Pibrac, 118, 200
Picard, 607, 816
Picavet, F., 96
Picoté, Père, 338
Picquart, General, 827
Pidansat de Mairobert, 465
Piedagnel, Alexandre, 796
Pierre de Bourbon, 147
Pierre de Saint-Cloud, 39, 63
Pierre le Picard, 107
Pigault-Lebrun, 606, 720, 855
Pillon, François, 813
Pindar, 185, 191, 198, 264, 580
Piron, 460, 486, 488, 573
Pissarro, Camille, 801
Pissarro, Lucien, 801
Pithou, Pierre, 247
Pius VII, 674
Pius X, 828, 834, 836
Pixerécourt, Guilbert de, 659, 692, *693–694*
Planat, Emile, 822
Planche, Gustave, 736
Plato, 96, 109, 157, 184, 187, 201, 207, 228, 250, 251, 254, 323, 405, 457, 531, 554, 641, 669, 687, 856, 857, 859
Plautus, 217, 219, 298, 319, 372, 478, 879
Plessis, Frédéric, 874
Plessis, Maurice du, 805
Plessis-Mornay, Du, 246, 256, 259, 392
Plotinus, 88, 96, 641
Plutarch, 201, 207, 208, 235, 263, 264, 308, 430, 454, 498, 502, 518, 522, 527, 529, 592
Pocques, 158
Poe, Edgar Allan, 724, 770, 776, 787, 792, 803, 804, 807, 809, 870
Poincaré, H., 831, 835, 874
Poincaré, Raymond, 840, 874
Poisson, 477
Polyandre, 281
Polybius, 498
Pomairols, Charles de, 874
Pomaré, 739
Pommier, Amédée, 799
Pompadour, Mme de, 464, 508, 551, 581
Pomponius Laetus, 136
Ponchon, Raoul, 422
Ponsard, 664, 703, 707, 779, 795
Ponson du Terrail, 723
Pope, 282, 382, 449, 506, 511, 565, 568, 624, 668
Porée, the P., 505
Porphyry, 95, 100
Porto-Riche, Georges de, 874
Potez, 449
Pouvillon, Emile, 778
Prades, abbé de, 542
Pradon, 358, 360, 411
Prévost, abbé, 448, 489, *492–494*
Prévost, Marcel, 874
Prévost-Paradol, 821
Primat de Saint-Denis, 57
Primaticcio, 134
Prior, 377, 462
Priscian, 95
Proclus, 88
Propertius, 183, 577
Protagoras, 829
Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph, *648–649*, 710, 737, 743
Provence, comte de, 552
Prudentius of Troyes, 52
Przedzięcka, Mme, 715
Ptolemy Philadelphus, 177

Puccini, 759
Pusey, Dr., 332

Q

Quesnay, Doctor, 551, 552, 553
Quesnel, Père, 501
Quillard, Pierre, 875
Quinault, 316, 359, 360, 361, 373, 477
Quinet, 628, 726, *727–729*, 730, 767
Quintilian, 187
Quintin, 158

R

Rabanus Maurus, 12
Rabelais, 63, 68, 70, 128, 135, 145, 149, *164–172*, 236, 238, 252, 258, 355, 368, 369, 372, 375, 435, 448, 497, 504, 530, 585, 689, 777
Racan, 264, *265–266*, 268, 278, 288, 294, 301
Rachel, 664
Rachilde, 842
Racine, 109, 215, 227, 255, 265, 269, 274, 281, 297, 303, 305, 316, 318, 334, 344, *350–361*, 364, 376, 377, 378, 382, 383, 384, 388, 393, 399, 404, 407, 409, 411, 423, 435, 467, 468, 470, 472, 476, 481, 482, 491, 515, 567, 580, 676, 688, 699, 766, 861, 867, 874
Racine, Louis, 567, 568
Radbertus Paschasius, 13
Radcliffe, Mrs., 606, 659, 693, 870
Raffaelli, 801
Rambouillet, marquise de, 270, 272, *277–279*, 281, 398
Rameau, 538
Rameau, Jean. See Lebaigt, Laurent
Ramus, 95, 155, 199, *201–204*, 224, 254, 323, 324
Randon, Gabriel. See Rictus, Jehan
Raoul de Presles, 114
Rapin, Nicolas, 247, 258, 382
Rapin Thoyras, 448
Ratisbonne, Louis, 796, 799
Ravaillac, 347
Ravaisson, Félix, 811
Ravignan, Père de, 638
Ravisius Textor, 210
Raymond de Sebonde, 232, 237
Raynal, abbé, 422, 549, 588
Raynaud, Ernest, 805
Raynouard, 602, 607
Rayssiguier, 294
Rebell, Hugues, 805
Reboux, Paul, 875
Récamier, Mme, 587, 619, 621, 635, 743
Regnard, 377, *477–478*, 479, 482
Régnier, Henri de, 801, 805, 875
Régnier, Mme Henri de, 865
Regnier, Mathurin, 254, 256, *257–259*, 266, 291, 369
Reid, 640
Rémusat, Charles de, 613
Rémusat, Paul de, 629
Renan, 4, 394, 532, 638, 726, 738, 740, 741, *750–756*, 810, 811, 815, 821, 837, 846, 860, 861, 867, 868
Renan, Henriette, 751
Renard, Jules, 875
Renaud, Armand, 796
Renaudot, Théophraste, *421*, 422
René of Anjou, 112
Renée de France, 150, 152, 156, 222
Renouard, 631
Renouvier, Charles, *811–813*, 831
Restif de la Bretonne, 489
Retté, Adolphe, 802
Retz, Cardinal de, 417, 421, 423, *424–425*, 428, 431
Reuchlin, 137
Revel, Jean. See Toutain, Paul
Reybaud, Louis, 629
Reynaud, Jean, 644, 719, 733
Ribot, Alexandre, 840, 875
Ribot, Théodule, 810
Ricard, Louis-Xavier de, 795, 796
Ricard, marquise de, 795
Riccoboni, Luigi, 480
Richard Cœur de Lion, 44, 46
Richard de Fournival, 107
Richard de Lison, 63
Richardson, 287, 449, 450, 463, 492, 494, 527, 539, 650
Richebourg, Emile, 723
Richelieu, 61, 253, 272, 273, 274, 277, 278, 295, 297, 302, 306, 311, 318, 364, 385, 421, 424, 426, 439, 683, 709, 863
Richepin, Jacques, 876
Richepin, Jean, 766, 850, 875, 876
Richer, 52
Richter, J. P., 531
Rictus, Jehan, 808
Rigaut de Barbézieux, 44
Rigolboche, 739
Rimbaud, Arthur, 803, 804
Rivarol, 450, 571, 590, 593, *595–596*
Rivoire, 843, 876
Roannez, duc de, 336
Robert (king of France), 53
Robert d'Auxerre, 53
Robert de Boron, 35
Robert de Clary, 58
Robert de Sorbon, 105
Robert, P., 354

Robespierre, 529, 532, 555, 575, 588, 589, *590–591*, 592, 594, 596, 643
Robineau, Madeleine, 281
Robinet, 422
Robinson, Crabbe, 610
Robortello, 214
Rocca, 610
Rochefort, Henri, 822
Roches, Mme des, 277
Rod, Edouard, 767, 876
Rodenbach, Georges, 805
Rodolphus Glaber, 53
Rohan, chevalier de, 506
Rojas y Zorilla, F. de, 319
Roland, Mme, 587, 592, 609
Rolland, Romain, 840, 876
Rollin, Charles, *601*, 574
Rollinat, Maurice, 808, 809
Ronsard, Pierre de, 145, 149, 174, 175, 176, 177, *178*, 179, 181, 183, 184, 185, 187, *188–197*, 204, 212, 216, 224, 225, 227, 228, 252, 256, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 294, 321, 380, 407, 430, 576, 577, 578, 579, 616, 653, 680, 689, 792
Roqueplan, Nestor, 738, 739
Rosamund, Fair, 30
Roscellinus, 90
Rosimond, 477
Rosny, J.-H., 767, 876, 877
Rossetti, 161
Rostand, 281, 298, 308, 359, 741, 796, 843, 872, *877–878*, 880
Rostand, Mme. See Gérard, Rosemonde
Rota, Berardino, 198
Rotrou, 233, 297, 298, 301, 302, 314, *318–320*, 364, 372
Roucher, 570, 575
Rouget de Lisle, 580
Rouher, Eugène, 816
Roujon, Henry, 878
Rousseau, J.-B., 457, 516, 566, 567
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 169, 246, 438, 449, 463, 483, 487, 489, 502, 503, 510, 513, 516, *518–535*, 542, 543, 547, 554, 560, 561, 562, 572, 574, 580, 588, 589, 590, 592, 596, 604, 609, 611, 613, 616, 617, 619, 621, 622, 625, 627, 633, 639, 650, 651, 657, 666, 692, 716, 717, 719, 720, 751, 772, 775, 841, 862, 867, 874
Rouxel, Geneviève, 261
Royer-Collard, 613, *632–633*, 640, 641
Rucellai, 210
Rustebeuf, 46, 69, 73
Ryer, Isaac du, 294
Ryer, Pierre du, 285, 298, 314, 364
Rymer, 450

S

Sabatier, Mme, 740
Sablé, Mme de, 281, 327, 334, *411–412*, 426
Sabran, Mme de, 587
Sacy, Silvestre de, 736, 821
Sade, marquis de, 490
Sadoleto, 142
Sagon, François, 152
Saint-Amand, 696
Saint-Amant, *268*, 290
Saint-Ange, Frère, 335
Saint-Cyran, Du Vergier de Hauranne, 333, 335, 349
Saint-Evremond, 313, *382–383*, 411, 413, 434, 435, 446, 448, 789
Saint-Gelais, Mellin de, 133, 153, 174, 181, 184, 197, 210
Saint-Gelais, Octovien de, 133, 149
Saint-Just, 591
Saint-Lambert, marquis de, 507, 520, 528, 570, 573
Saint-Marc Girardin, 734, 736, 821
Saint-Martin, 603, 626
Saint-Martin, Mme de, 410
Saint-Pierre, abbé de, 444, 461
Saint-Réal, 361
Saint-Simon, comte de, *643–645*, 647, 726
Saint-Simon, duc de, 423, *431–433*, 438
Saint-Victor, Paul de, 740, 817
Sainte-Beuve, 80, 133, 146, 179, 235, 265, 271, 359, 377, 576, 602, 616, 623, 624, 625, 636, 644, 653, 658, 660, 661, 672, 716, 738, 740, *741–746*, 747, 792, 800, 812, 817, 818, 821
Sainte-Marthe, Scévole de, 177, 530
Salel, Hugues, 181
Sales, François de, 256, 285, 335, 342, *346–347*, 388, 401, 404, 412
Salis, Rodolphe, 807
Sallo, Denis de, 422
Sallust, 52, 109, 687
Salmon Maigret (Macrin), 174
Samain, Albert, 801, 802, 805
Sanchez, 252, 341
Sanctis, de, 818
Sand, George, 449, 665, 676, 677, 678, 704, 706, 707, 708, 712, *715–720*, 724, 737, 761, 783, 793, 809, 843, 847, 863
Sandeau, Jules, 707, 715, 736, 780
Sanderson, 536
Sandras, Courtilz de, 710
Sangnier, Marc, 834
Sannazaro, 152, 183, 196, 285
Sansovino, 258
Sarcey, 781, 785, 806, 818, 852
Sardou, 695, 779, *784*, 785

Sarrasin, 274, 281
Sasso, Pamphilo, 198
Saxe, Maurice de, 715
Say, J.-B., 602
Scaliger, Julius Cæsar, 143, 212, 295
Scarron, *288–289*, 291, 298, 299, 364, 367, 370, 382, 410, 416, 679
Scarron, Mme, 410, 416. See also Maintenon, Mme de
Scève, Maurice, 153, *160–161*, 174, 181, 184, 226, 804
Schelandre, Jean de, 302
Schelling, 641, 728, 752
Scherer, Edmond, 817
Scheurer-Kestner, 827
Schiller, 530, 610, 697
Schlegel, 473, 612, 614, 651
Schleiermacher, 530
Schneider, Hortense, 740
Scholl, Aurélien, 739, 822
Schopenhauer, 876
Scott, Walter, 655, 657, 658, 697, 700, 708, 709, 720, 726, 727, 762
Scotus Erigena, 88, 96
Scribe, Eugène, *703–705*, 736, 779, 785, 788
Scudéry, Georges de, 278, 287, 289, 295, 298, 302, 311, 312
Scudéry, Mlle de, 106, 274, 276, 277, 279, *281*, 284, 287, 366, 371, 373, 376, 378, 409, 413, 774, 801
Sebillet, 133, *181*, 376
Secchi, Niccolò, 365
Séché, 698
Secrétan, 876
Secundus, 192, 569
Sedaine, 485, *488*, 693
Segrais, 409, 411, 415, *439–440*
Ségur, Mme de, 778
Ségur, Pierre de, 879
Seigneur, Jehan du, 663
Seignobos, 816, 866
Sellius, 541
Senancour, *624–626*, 716, 841
Seneca, 87, 117, 121, 201, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 215, 223, 229, 235, 264, 408, 435, 502, 849
Serafino dall' Aquila, 153, 160, 194
Serlo of Wilton, 48
Serre, de, 632
Serres, Olivier de, 256
Servatus Lupus, 12
Servetus, 222
Sévigné, Mme de, *412–414*, 417, 423, 425
Sévigné, marquis de, 412
Sextus Empiricus, 237
Seyssel, Claude de, 141, 148
Seytres, de, 502
Shaftesbury, 470
Shakspere, 25, 38, 42, 77, 110, 208, 227, 239, 254, 269, 305, 372, 373, 449, 470, 471, 472, 474, 506, 651, 655, 687, 697, 706, 861, 872
Shelley, 187
Sibillet. See Sebillet.
Sieffert, Louisa, 790
Sieyès, abbé, *694–695*
Sigibertus Gemblacensis, 53
Signac, 801
Silvestre, Armand, 799
Silvia. See Benozzi, Giannetta
Simeon Stylites, 758
Simon, 39
Simon, Jules, 814
Simon, Richard, 391, 446, 454
Sirven, 509
Smith, Adam, 552
Smithson, Miss, 697
Smollett, 491
Socrates, 96
Sophocles, 210, 408, 687, 794, 856
Sorel, Albert, 448, 815
Sorel, Charles, *288*, 370
Soulary, Joséphin, 799
Soulié, Frédéric, 695, 699, 711, 723, 736
Soumet, 658, 696
Souvestre, Emile, 724
Souza, Robert de, 879
Spencer, Herbert, 645, 760, 853
Spenser, 152, 179
Sperone Speroni, 187
Spinoza, 327, 512, 746
Spuller, E., 633, 822
Spurzheim, 602
Staal-Delaunay, Mme de, 444, 462
Staël, Mme de, 271, 465, 587, 605, 606, *609–615*, 623, 630, 632, 650, 651, 725, 734
Staël-Holstein, baron de, 609
Stanhope, Hester, Lady, 670
Statius, 12, 36, 37, 39, 48, 95, 121, 215, 264
Steele, 449
Stendhal, 652, 653, 708, *711–713*, 714, 723, 747, 851
Sterne, 171, 239, 449, 492, 538, 539, 606
Straparola, 172
Strauss (composer), 762
Strauss (historian), 673
Strowski, F., 234
Suard, Mme, 587
Sudre, 64
Sue, Eugène, 369, 708, 723, 724, 736
Suetonius, 52, 109, 353, 356
Suger, 53
Sully, 252–253
Sully, Maurice de, 391
Sully Prudhomme, 796, *797*, 874

Sulpicius Rufus, Servius, 263, 614
Surchamp, Henri, 872
Surville, Clotilde de, 608
Surville, marquis de, 608
Swedenborg, 603
Swetchine, Mme, 637, 781
Swift, 506
Sylvester, Joshua, 225
Sylvester II, 13
Symonds, J. A., 48, 764
Syveton, 864

T

Tabarin, 294
Tacitus, 14, 229, 356, 426, 498, 594
Tahureau, Jacques, 177, 197
Tailhade, Laurent, 846, 879
Taille, Jacques de la, 214
Taille, Jean de la, 214, 217
Taine, 62, 69, 255, 438, 656, 713, 726, 738, 740, 741, 743, 744, *746–760*, 751, 757, 759, 810, 811, 815, 821, 846, 849, 851
Tallemant des Réaux, 278, 423, *426*
Talleyrand, 614
Talma, 605, 107
Tansillo, Luigi, 198, 261
Tarde, Gabriel, 813
Tasso, 225, 258, 285, 408, 666, 687
Tassoni, 382
Tastu, Mme Amable, 681
Tavernier, 496
Taylor, H., 500
Tebaldeo, 153, 195, 198
Tencin, Mme de, 457, 462, 464, 495, 550
Tennyson, 34
Terence, 116, 217, 219, 355, 366, 373, 381, 434, 687
Tesson, Francis, 796
Texte, 492
Thackeray, 722, 759
Theganus, 52
Theocritus, 183, 193, 196, 577, 687, 794
Théodamas, 281
Theodulfus the Goth, 11, 12, 13
Théophile. See Viau, Théophile de
Theophrastus, 429, 430
Theresa, Saint, 401
Theurict, André, 778, 796
Thibaut de Blois, 44
Thibaut de Champagne, 44, 46, 57
Thieriot, 505
Thierry, Amédée, 726
Thierry, Augustin, 644, 725, *726–727*, 747
Thierry de Chartres, 89
Thiers, Adolphe, 575, 629, *634*, *732*, 735, 816
Thomas, 28, 30
Thomas, A.-L., 474, 574, 588
Thomas Aquinas, St., 91, 92, 93, 96, 99, 102, 103, 104, 232, 339, 515, 833
Thomas-à-Becket, 54, 102
Thomas of Bologna, 118
Thomas of Celano, 47
Thomson, 449, 570, 803
Thou, De, 229, 242, 423, 725
Thoulier, the P., 505
Thucydides, 687
Thureau-Dangin, Paul-Marie-Pierre, 879
Thyard, Pontus de, 160, 162, 177, 178, *180*, 184, 194, 197
Tibaud of Vernon, 54
Tibullus, 183, 577
Tinayre, Marcelle, 879
Tinseau, Léon de, 879
Tiphernas, Gregorio, 137
Tissard, François, 137
Tocqueville, Alexis de, *733–734*
Tolstoy, 818, 841, 843, 874, 876
Torricelli, 335
Tournemine, the P., 505
Tournon, Cardinal de, 132
Toutain, Paul, 875
Traviès, Charles, 656
Trébutien, 775
Tréfeu, 740
Tressan, comte de, 488, 778
Trissino, 154, 210, 213
Tristan l'Hermite, 288, 293, 298
Trogus Pompeius, 121
Tronchin, 521
Troterel, Pierre, 294
Turgenev, 740
Turgot, 543, *552–554*
Turlupin, 294
Turnèbe, Odet de, 217
Turoldus, 22
Tyrrell, Father, 836
Tyrtæus, 580

U

Ulbach, Louis, 778
Urbain Grandier, 401
Urfé, d', 278, 284, *285–286*, 287, 297, 301, 347, 719

V

Vabre, Jules, 663
Vacherot, Etienne, 811
Vacquerie, Auguste, 787, 796

Vair, Du, 240, 251, 335, 342
Valade, Léon, 796, 799
Valera, Juan, 682
Valerius Maximus, 121
Vandal, Albert, 816
Van Dale, 456
Vandérem, Fernand. See Vanderheym, F.-H.
Vanderheym, Fernand-Henri, 879
Vanini, 345
Vanloo, 564
Van Pauteren, 348
Varro, 247
Vascosan, 205
Vatable, 152
Vatel, 414
Vaucaire, Maurice, 879
Vaugelas, 270, *273*, 278, 410
Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, 256, 257, *259–260*, 264, 321, 376
Vauvenargues, *601–604*, 513, 606
Vaux, Mme Clotilde de, 646
Veber, Pierre, 879
Vegetius, 119
Vendôme, Philippe de, 462
Vergecio, Angelo, 180
Vergne, Marie de la. See Fayette, Mme de la
Vergniaud, 592
Verhaeren, Emile, 805
Verlaine, Paul, 796, 801, *803–804*, 862, 875
Verne, Jules, 778
Véron, Dr., 736
Veuillot, Louis, 638, 730, 736, 781, 821, 838
Vianey, J., 195
Viau, Théophile de, 190, 254, *267–268*, 297, 345
Viaud, Julien. See Loti, Pierre
Vicaire, Gabriel, 796, 799
Vico, 729
Vida, 187
Vidocq, 722
Viélé-Griffin, 572, 801, 805
Vien, 575
Vigny, Alfred de, 653, 658, 659, 661, 662, 668, *671–675*, *702–703*, 709, 710, 792, 797, 800, 874
Vilgard, 87
Villanovanus, 142
Villars, maréchal de, 502
Villedieu, Mme de. See Desjardins, Hortense
Villehardouin, 51, *57*, 60
Villèle, M. de, 630
Villemain, Abel, 734
Villemessant, H. de. See Cartier, J.-H.
Villemin, Eugène, 796
Villiers, 368, 370, 477
Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, 774, *776*, 796, 803, 870
Villon, François, 47, 85, 117, *122–124*, 803, 808
Vincent de Beauvais, 101, 102, *103–104*, 541
Vincent de Paul, 392, 638
Vincent, Charles. See Maël, Pierre
Vinciguerra, 258
Vinet, 397
Vintimille, Mme de, 605
Viollis, Jean. See Ardenne de Tizac, H.
Viret, Pierre, 221
Virgil, 3, 12, 36, 37, 38, 40, 48, 87, 95, 109, 116, 121, 183, 185, 186, 196, 226, 258, 264, 382, 405, 408, 440, 507, 570, 577, 580, 687, 729
Virieu, Aymon de, 666
Visagier, Jean, 175
Vitelli, Cornelio, 136
Vitet, Ludovic, 697
Vitruvius, 211
Vittorino da Feltre, 168, 238
Vivès, 238
Vivien, Renée, 842
Vizé, Donneau de, 368, 422
Vogüé, Charles-Jean Melchior de, 880
Vogüé, Eugène Melchior de, 741, 817, 880
Voisin, la, 358, 398
Voiture, *281–285*, 385, 412, 439, 462
Volland, Mlle, 539
Volney, *555–556*, 587, 601, 614
Voltaire. 191, 210, 269, 276, 337, 353, 422, 443, 447, 448, 449, 450, 455, 458, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 466, *467–474*, 482, 488, 489, 491, 502, *505–517*, 522, 525, 528, 532, 537, 539, 543, 549, 551, 553, 568, 569, 570, 571, 573, 579, 582, 590, 594, 596, 605, 607, 623, 626, 650, 652, 675, 677, 678, 687, 725, 774, 860, 866
Voretzsch, 14, 28, 41
Vossius, 295
Vulteius, 175

W

Wace, 28, 56
Wafflard, 704
Wagner, 34, 776, 792, 805, 862
Walafridus Strabo, 12, 101
Waldeck-Rousseau, René, 817, 840
Walon de Beaupuis, 349
Walpole, Horace, 462, 463, 464, 513, 572
Warens, Mme de, 518, 519, 528, 531, 720
Washington, George, 617, 634

Watriquet de Couvin, 69
Watteau, 481, 564, 764, 877
Webster, Daniel, 389
Webster, Pelatiah, 500
Weeks, R., 23
Weil, René. See Coolus, Romain
Weiss, J.-J., 817, 821
Wenceslaus of Luxembourg, 59
Whitman, Walt, 802, 849
Wieland. 450
Wiener, F. 854
Wilbois, 835
Wilde. Oscar, 659, 762, 777, 862, 873
William Longsword, 30
William of Tyre, 56
Willy, Colette, 880
Wilson, W. Lawler, 591
Winckelmann, 450, 575, 614
Winter, Henry, 796
Wintzenried, 519
Wolff, Albert, 739
Wolff, Pierre, 843, 880
Wolfram von Eschenbach, 34
Wolmar, Melchior, 222, 223
Wordsworth, 187, 572, 668, 669
Wulf, Maurice de, 96
Wycherly, 372

X

Xanrof, 808
Xenocritus, 578
Xenophon, 114, 405, 631

Y

Young, 449, 517, 565, 608, 650
Yver, Colette. See Huzard, Mme Antoinette,

Z

Zamacois, 843, 880
Zola, Emile, 69, 665, 750, 757, 758, 760, 762, *765–769*, 772, 776, 778, 823, 828, 840, 855, 863, 871

HW 5RU3 S

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED THE COST OF OVERDUE NOTIFICATION IF THIS BOOK IS NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW.

WIDENER
CANCELLED
MAY 21 1950

BOOK DUE WID
597 45
FEB 1978
CANCELLED
FEB 1978

DE